

The Nation

Vol. CVI

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1918

No. 2764

The Week

IT is too bad that the issue of open diplomacy should be clouded by the use of such ambiguous language as the President employs in his memorandum to Secretary Lansing, read in the Senate on June 12. Mr. Wilson's address to Congress on January 8 declared that "it will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open." In the same address the President formulated fourteen points of a peace programme, the first of which affirmed that "open covenants of peace must be arrived at." Early in March Senator Borah, of Idaho, taking the President at his word, introduced a resolution for the discussion of treaties in open session, unless the Senate, by vote of four-fifths of its members, should order an executive session. The only difference, apparently, between the two demands was that while the President spoke only with reference to the peace which should end the war, Senator Borah's resolution expressly contemplated a permanent rule, not limited to the period of the war. To the surprise of every one who, like Senator Borah, had perceived in the President's statement only a clear and unequivocal demand for the open discussion of peace terms, Mr. Wilson opposed the resolution. In his memorandum to Secretary Lansing, written on March 12, but not made public until three months later, the President stated that, when he "pronounced for open diplomacy," he meant "not that there should be no private discussions of delicate matters, but that no secret agreements should be entered into, and that all international relations, when fixed, should be open, above board, and explicit."

WHAT is meant by "fixed" will now have to be explained, if the President is not to lay himself open to the charge of bad faith. His demand in January was for an "open" view of the "processes of peace," with no reservation of "delicate matters." The "processes" of peace clearly include not only the formulation of terms, but also the discussion of terms after they have been formulated and while the treaty which embodies them is before the Senate for ratification; for the "process" is not complete until the Senate has acted. If, by the dubious explanation which he now offers, Mr. Wilson means no more than that a treaty, after it has been ratified by the Senate, shall be published, the procedure which he favors looks to no change in previous practice. The United States has always published the treaties to which it was a party. If, on the other hand, he means that a treaty, once it has been drafted, shall be made public pending ratification, he again only approves a practice which the United States has often followed. The trouble is that this latter contention does not in the least accord with Mr. Wilson's earlier declaration in favor of open diplomacy. What the people of this country and of every Allied country have to fear is that the formulation of peace terms, involving the gravest and most complicated world questions which have arisen since 1815, will be carried on behind closed doors, and that the treaty, when so

framed, will be submitted to the Senate backed by all the influence of the Administration to secure its ratification. This is not open diplomacy. Mr. Wilson should lose no time in further explaining his explanation.

THE decision of the executive committee of the British Labor party to recommend to its party conference on June 26 that the party terminate the political truce which has been in existence since the beginning of the war is the most important political news from England since the decision to enforce conscription in Ireland. It means that the British Labor party feels itself strong enough to strike out vigorously in anticipation of the coming general election, and that it considers the military situation of such a nature that it must begin to fight to obtain control of the Government in order to carry on the war itself. Certainly there must be some strong reason for the decision to return to partisan warfare. Such action will doubtless give great joy to the Irish members of Parliament, and it should make a most interesting political summer in England. We cannot believe that, short of a revolution, the Labor party will win a majority of seats in the new Parliament, but we can well imagine that this decision of Mr. Arthur Henderson will set Lloyd George to wondering whether after all the general election cannot be postponed until next year. Of course, much will depend upon the progress of the military situation. If it appears at all likely that peace by negotiation is inevitable this fall, the British Labor party, which has earned the political leadership in ideas and ideals of England to-day, will feel that it, more than any other party, should be in control when it comes to the questions of peace.

AS the weeks have passed, it has become increasingly clear, if the situation ever needed clarification, that the real leaders of British and American labor are hopelessly at variance concerning certain fundamentals of both war policy and peace policy. The issue has been joined, needless to say, on the specific question of an inter-belligerent labor conference. The striking fact is that even the tremendous German offensive has not sufficed to stay the drift to the left in the British labor movement, and the statesmanship of Mr. Henderson and his colleagues is clearly designed to prevent that drift from flowing into destructive channels, and to hold British labor strong and true to the peace of President Wilson. In this task the British leaders need American help, and unfortunately they have had thus far American hindrance. The attitude of our labor delegation was calculated to strengthen the hands of the Tories in British politics and of the reactionary minority in the British labor movement. That way lies destruction for our hopes of success in the war and for the peace by a strange irony known abroad as an "American" peace.

IT is now suggested that Mr. Gompers go abroad and attempt to unsnarl the tangle. We sincerely trust that the attempt will be made. The war is to be won only by a united front on the part of Allied labor in behalf of a democratic peace and no other kind. As Mr. Henderson's

EDUCATION LIBRARY

declaration shows beyond cavil, British labor is a unit with American labor and the American public generally in refusing to consider anything else. The more need, then, that we understand the situation in Great Britain, and cooperate with the forces there that alone can bring victory to the cause of freedom. Those forces at present are in the Labor party, and not in the camp of its enemies. The report of the American delegation just made at St. Paul indicates that our union leaders fear to work in harmony with that party because they are afraid of its Socialism. Therefore they propose to start a backfire on this greatest of the world's democratic groups by fostering a rival movement in Great Britain. We cannot believe that such an attitude rests on a real understanding of the situation confronting Mr. Henderson; for in view of that situation no course could be better adapted to aid Germany and thus prevent the triumph of the ideals of President Wilson. Let Mr. Gompers by all means go abroad, but let him go with the purpose first to learn and understand, and then to work in harmony with the British democratic movement. There is no other road to success.

RIGOROUS economy in the use of coal, wheat, and meat must still be practiced, if the imperative needs of the Allies and of American consumers are to be met. The coal situation is serious in the extreme, especially as regards the supply of anthracite. Estimates prepared by the Fuel Administration show a probable demand, for the year ending April 1, 1919, of at least 80,000,000 tons more coal than was mined last year. The full significance of the figure is apparent only when we remember that the production last year exceeded by 50,000,000 tons the output of any previous year. By cutting off the supply of anthracite from the States beyond the Mississippi, and by severe restrictions in other directions, the amount of anthracite available for domestic consumption will, it is hoped, be increased by about five per cent. over what was available last year. Everything depends, however, upon the ability of the mines to exceed their previous maximum production, the ability of the railroads to furnish transportation, and the willingness of consumers to submit to drastic restrictions. The mines are faced with an alarming shortage of labor, and are not yet maintaining a volume of output sufficient to prevent an absolute shortage. Many cities are ordering reserve stocks of coal, and putting strong pressure upon consumers to place their orders at once. It is not yet clear, however, that an absolute shortage can be prevented. Since essential war industries must be kept going at all hazards, restriction must affect most severely the non-essential industries and the domestic consumer.

THE wheat situation is more hopeful. The Government crop report shows an estimated yield of 931,000,000 bushels. This is the second largest in our history. The outlook for spring wheat and oats is also encouraging. The figures ought to mean a reasonably abundant supply of cereals, for the Allies as well as ourselves, next winter. Even if the per capita domestic consumption of the past year cannot, in view of the continuance of foreign demands, be exceeded, the danger of depleted vitality in the population generally will not have to be faced. For the moment, however, we must not only continue to be economical, but must practice further economies. Mr. Hoover has asked for an entire giving up of the use of wheat, from now until

the next harvest, as the only means of meeting the requirements of the army and the needs of the Allies. The use of beef, also, must be curtailed. The Food Administration has requested hotels and restaurants to reduce the serving of beef to one or two meals weekly, while householders are asked to cut down their purchases to a weekly maximum of not more than one and one-quarter pounds of clear beef, or one and one-half pounds including bone, per person. This is yet far from a famine ration, especially as the supply of pork is still sufficient; and there should be, as there doubtless will be, immediate and full conformity to Mr. Hoover's request. If America can meet the food and fuel situation by voluntary reduction of consumption, the moral victory will be worth the cost.

EVEN more striking than the control exercised by the Government over commodity distribution and prices is the strong grip it has taken on the labor situation. We noted last week that it was assuming entire charge of the employment and distribution of labor on the docks at the chief ports. Now comes a vastly more far-reaching announcement. Beginning with July 15, all industries employing more than 100 men will be compelled to obtain common labor through the Federal Employment Service, and the restriction will be extended to cover skilled workers as rapidly as the machinery can be placed in operation. This sweeping measure amounts to an attempt to put the placement of the whole industrial labor supply of the country into the hands of one huge Federal labor exchange. It is specifically designed to put an end to competitive bidding by employers in the labor market, which is at present resulting in a disastrously large labor turnover, and thus evidently involves the standardization of wages by the Government authorities. Its object, of course, is, while avoiding conscription of labor, to get every man into the place where he can be most useful and then keep him there, not allowing private interests of competing employers to interfere with the stability required by the emergency.

MEANWHILE the other side of the same problem is being gradually worked out, not without some tumult and shouting on the part of those affected, by the National War Labor Board. The placing of ex-President Taft and Mr. Walsh on the same board for adjusting labor difficulties seemed at the time not without elements of humor, yet the combination appears to have proved a peculiarly happy one. One of the most difficult tasks attacked by the Board thus far has been the adjustment of the difficulties between the telegraph companies and their employees. The unyielding attitude of the companies in face of the recommendations of the Board finally obliged the President to intervene, and in his courteous letter of Friday last he practically ordered the heads of the companies to yield obedience to the Board. His letter serves notice to the parties on both sides in important industries that no serious labor disputes will be tolerated, and that the decision of the Government agency must be accepted. The Federal Government, for the period of the war, thus practically assumes ultimate responsibility for the placement of labor, for the determination of wages and hours, and for the adjustment of the difficulties that will inevitably arise. It is a power unexampled in our history, and must raise grave questions as to how much or how little of the arrangement now being effected we shall wish to retain after the war is over.

THE steady emergence of serious problems of this sort only emphasizes the need for a Reconstruction Board to study such questions and to help formulate our after-war policy. While our last week's issue, calling for the establishment of such a board, was on the press, the news came that Congressman Edmonds had introduced a bill calling for the creation of "a commission to investigate the problems of reconstruction." The proposal to constitute the commission of ten Senators and ten Representatives we regard as a mistake; for busy legislators cannot give to the work the time that its supreme importance demands. We therefore hope to see the measure passed in a form that will give us a board of the most competent men obtainable, of all shades of political and economic opinion, and able to devote full time to their exacting duties. With a staff of trained investigators, in full coöperation with existing Government agencies and with the Reconstruction Ministry in England, such a body could scarcely fail to perform a service of untold value in informing and guiding public opinion towards actual constructive measures in the new period of colossal social experimentation on which we are entered. Construction, not destruction, must be our aim.

AN illustration of the sort of thinking that must be done in this connection is furnished in Secretary Lane's letter to the President, made public on Thursday, concerning the question of land for the returning soldier. In the midst of his manifold duties Secretary Lane is not too busy to envisage the problem that will be presented by the return of hundreds of thousands or millions of soldiers to a country possessing no such public domain as was at our disposal in 1865. Happily possessed of the economic wisdom to realize the importance of the land question, the Secretary in a few bold strokes sketches the conditions we face to-day, by contrast with those of fifty years ago; and out of his rich knowledge of our existing natural resources he puts forth a series of statesmanlike suggestions for making the land serve the interests at once of the returned soldier and of his country. All that is to be done, he points out, must be on a definite planning basis. "This," he says, "is an immediate duty. It will be too late to plan for these things when the war is over. Our thought now should be given to the problem." The sort of service that could be rendered by a Reconstruction Board working in coöperation with such a broad-minded and well-informed department head as Secretary Lane requires no comment, and there is scarcely a division of the Government that does not offer opportunity for like coöperation.

THE most interesting political news of the week has been the acceptance by Henry Ford, Republican, of the nomination for the Senatorship from Michigan unanimously tendered him by the Democratic Convention. He stated that he did so at the request of the President, and it is not unlikely that he will receive the Republican nomination as well. With all respect for the President's desires, the Senate will hardly gain much intellectually if Mr. Ford should take his seat in that august body. One of the most interesting men in America, and doubtless one of the most useful from the point of view of war work, Mr. Ford's views on public questions seem no profounder or wiser than his opinions as to peace when he sent the peace ship to Europe in 1915. Nothing could have been more naïve than his attitude towards that extraordinary expedition. He really believed that he

BEREA, OHIO
would have "the boys out of the trenches by Christmas," and he placed himself entirely in the hands of an Austro-Hungarian woman and a young man from Chicago with whom his acquaintance was of the slightest, not even stopping to test their assertions that there was a practical basis to the venture or their assurances from Europe of a favorable reception of the expedition. Nor did he even wait to ascertain if really useful persons could be induced to join the Oscar II. It was a fine humanitarian impulse that prompted Mr. Ford's action, the same kind of an impulse that led him to fix a minimum wage of \$5 a day in his factories and to throw open their doors to ex-convicts. But just now something more than kindly impulse is needed in the Senate, which will face the most momentous problems in our history during the next six years.

SIMILARLY stimulating has been the offer of Oscar S. Straus, who has just resigned as Chairman of the Public Service Commission in New York city, to enter Congress if he can obtain a nomination and election without a partisan contest. This reflects again the widespread desire to eliminate politics in the approaching Congressional election, and it is surely an attractive proposal to have a man of Mr. Straus's knowledge of Eastern European affairs sitting in Congress. Then there is no delegation in Washington which so much needs toning up as that from New York city. If Tammany could see the opportunity and ask others of the type of Mr. Straus to serve, it could advance considerably towards that respectability which it constantly insists is its aim. Let us by all means strengthen Congress wherever possible, whether we do it because we are thinking only of prosecuting the war, or of our war aims, or because we desire to improve the efficiency of that body in dealing with the innumerable problems, social, economic, and political, which the war has created. Under no circumstances, however, should we elect a Congress to be only of one mind and to feel itself freed from the responsibility of scrutinizing every proposal laid before it, criticising freely and dividing as untrammelled judgment dictates.

THE commencement season now concluding calls attention anew to the disappearance of the news of our intercollegiate contests. It was not long ago that the displaying of the results of the Harvard-Yale race and the Yale-Princeton baseball games upon our first pages seemed essential to the proper recording of our national life. This year the great intercollegiate contests have passed almost unnoticed, and the attendance at them has been insignificant compared to the crowds of former years. The Harvard-Yale boat race attracted almost no attention, and the annual regatta at Princeton was exactly like an English 'varsity contest, without special trains, hordes of non-university spectators, or endless touting in the press. Those deeply interested stood on the bank of the lake and looked on. Despite the absence of so many men at the war, the 'varsity crews have been good crews and the races pretty ones. In other words, intercollegiate contests have at last shrunk to their proper position in our collegiate life. May we not hope for the formation of a society to keep them there after the war is over? We have learned, indeed, that our universities can live without any such contests at all, and even if our costly stadiums and "bowls" must remain unused, the present happy situation—particularly the abolition of paid coaches—is too fortunate a one to be lost.

The German Check—and After

AS foreshadowed last week, the fourth German offensive came to an end early—within six days. While a most difficult terrain was taken from the French and the ground conquered in the March and in the May offensives was connected by fresh acquisitions of territory, the Germans, whether by design or otherwise, failed to take Compiègne—a most important base for an attack upon Paris. Indeed, if the Germans should reach Compiègne and the three important railway bases which are within easy striking distance thereof, the French would be compelled to fight a final battle for Paris. As it is, the offensive stopped, after severe losses, within five miles of Compiègne, which must now be added to the growing list of deserted and utterly ruined French cities of which Rheims and Amiens are the most conspicuous examples. It is idle to deny that the question whether Paris shall soon be added to this list of cities ruined by the Prussian vandals is the all-important one of the hour for the Allies.

For neither the checks west of Soissons and on the Matz, nor the opening of the new Austrian offensive in Italy, should lead to the hasty opinion so freely expressed in the press that the Germans have been definitely and finally balked in this march on Paris. For that final check every one who is pro-Ally must pray as never before. But the fact that there are still many German divisions in reserve which have not struck a blow, makes it impossible to believe that the Kaiser will be content to stop now, when his Ministers are openly declaring that a large part of the French army is beaten, and that the situation never looked so favorable to them. Again, however terrible the German losses may be, the Kaiser and Hindenburg are ready to spend many more lives, for the existence of the German throne depends upon it. The German militarists, by the definite promise of a victory this year, have held their people in check and fortified them to bear the horrible privations they are enduring. They have until the end of the summer to make good their promise, and as long as they have sheep to drive to the slaughter the sheep will be driven. The offensive in Italy, whether successful or unsuccessful, is part of the programme of striking steadily in one place after the other along the whole great line from the Adriatic to the Channel. How successful it will be it is impossible to forecast at this writing; everything is promising for the Italians, but much will turn upon the morale of the Italian troops and upon their numbers and the number of the French and British forces, rushed to Italy last fall, which have been recalled since the disastrous 21st of March last. Some of the choicest French reserves went there last October; many have reappeared in France upon the firing line within the last two months. The battle will probably not be decided until this issue of the *Nation* is in the hands of its readers; it can only be recorded here that thus far the omens are entirely favorable. It goes without saying that a defeat of this offensive or even its checking with slight losses will be bound to produce a violent reaction in Austria, where the conditions are already so ominous for the two Kaisers.

If the check to the Germans obviously gives ground for fresh courage and hope, since it is a breathing spell during which the defences of Paris are being strengthened and such French reserves are being placed in position as remain, together with all the Americans that can be thrown in, the

American public ought to understand that, as Mr. Asquith stated on Friday, the gravity of the crisis cannot be overestimated. Our public has been very much put upon by the half-truths and otherwise misleading reports in the press dispatches during the last month, which have, with creditable motives but entirely mistaken judgment, sought to give the situation a favorable color which it does not merit. This is not a time for closing our eyes to disagreeable facts any more than it is one for panic and faintheartedness. What is of the utmost importance is that our people should realize that the military burden of winning the war rests squarely upon the United States, and that if we cannot bear it the war is lost.

Should any one think this an exaggeration or a bit of hysteria, we would remind our readers that the French press has stated this in so many words. Thus, the *Echo de Paris* speaks of the French winning "together with young America," and *Le Journal* frankly places all its hopes upon the young and vigorous American army, which it hopes will be formed about the time that the German reserves are exhausted. Before us lies a statement made in April by one of the most famous and successful French commanders in which he declares that the British army cannot be reorganized and made fit for offensive purposes for more than a year. Other French officers say frankly that their army must now look to America for its soldier material, and there has come an intimation from France this week that American soldiers may have to become part of French and British regiments. General Smuts is even quoted as having stated on May 19 in Glasgow, when the freedom of the city was bestowed upon him, that a military victory is no longer possible; that the Boche "has knocked this idea out of our heads." Without subscribing to this opinion, we cite it as another example of the changed conditions abroad, and we point to the gravity of the situation as proof of the correctness of President Wilson's statement that we are at the very crisis of the war and that this is the crucial year.

Do the American people realize this? We fear they do not. They do not appreciate how terrible will be the blow to the French "will-to-fight" if German shells should begin to destroy Paris—Paris, the pride and joy of every French man and French woman, from which it is reported 50,000 women and children have already been removed. Americans ought to appreciate it; they ought to understand that even if the enemy is held on the exact lines of to-day, everything will still hang upon America. This means that if America is to help and save, it now must begin to think from the point of view of one upon whom the ultimate decision rests. We have become the stroke oar in a boat in which the rest of the crew are nearly exhausted. We must, therefore, assume the leadership and begin to plan with a clear-cut realization of the crisis and what it demands. We must formulate our own policy for carrying on the war. Ships, rifles, and men are going forward in satisfactory quantities and with remarkable speed; criticism no longer lies there. But on the other hand, there is no adequate visualizing of the extent of the crisis, no understanding that we are suddenly become the Atlas bearing upon our shoulders the whole Allied world and its hopes for defeating the worst aggregation of conscienceless militarists the world has produced. What beyond the immediate emergency is to be our policy; for what are we planning to make a falsehood of General Smuts's words? It is a moment to test every bit of statesmanship in the country.

Russia and Recognition

IT is now a little more than seven months since the Russian Maximalists ousted Kerensky from power and Lenine and Trotzky took over the direction of the Russian Government. From that moment, the question of the attitude which the Allies and the United States ought to take towards the Bolshevik régime became one of grave importance. Only three possibilities, apparently, presented themselves. One was to recognize the Bolsheviks, formally or informally, gain the good will of the new Russian democracy, and insure the continuance of Russian help, imperfect as it might be, in resisting Germany and winning the war. Another was to repudiate the Lenine-Trotsky Government and intervene by force to bring about either the restoration to power of Kerensky and his followers, or the establishment of some other Government with which the United States and the Allies could coöperate. The third was to wash one's hands of the whole business and leave Russia to follow its own devices, to go over to the German side if it must, or stew in revolution if it chose.

What the Allies and the United States have done is to adopt the third of these possibilities, while at the same time threatening to adopt the second. For months now, and increasingly during the past few weeks, there has been talk of intervention. The prominence which has been given of late in the press to advocacy of such a course bears all the earmarks of a powerful, well-organized, and amply subsidized propaganda. It has been no secret from the beginning that England and France favored intervention. Japan, for it, and with a special interest from the obvious fact that the military burden, in the present plight of the Allies on the western front, would devolve principally upon the land empire. The only thing that has prevented the beginning of Japanese or Allied operations in Siberia, with European Russia as the objective, has been the opposition of President Wilson. We see no reason to believe that President Wilson's views in the matter have converted either European or Japanese statesmen, or that the financial and business interests which naturally favor a "strong policy" with Russia share his opinion. But the United States holds the whiphand in the war; without the aid of the United States the Allied cause is lost; and what the Government of the United States proposes the Governments of the Allies and Japan must accept. We may rest assured that there will be no armed intervention in Russia until the United States consents, and President Wilson thus far declines to consent.

Russia, meantime, has been left to itself. Temporarily exhausted by war, its economic life thrown into extreme disorder, its transportation system broken down, its credit jeopardized or destroyed, and its political thought stirred to violent agitation by the overthrow of the old order and revolutionary experiments with a new, it has been left to cope its way to light and safety under difficulties without parallel in history. Neither from the Allies collectively nor from any of them singly has it received any assistance worth mentioning in meeting German aggression or reestablishing its own internal life. Beaten, robbed, and left for dead, its former friends have passed by on the other side. The political ideas for which the Bolsheviks stand have been ridiculed, misrepresented, and denounced, and the press has had to submit to the censoring of Russian news. Such turning

over of a great people to divisive forces within and without, on the plea that, since armed intervention is undesirable, no other policy save that of let alone could possibly be considered, is a spectacle which every true friend of Russia, as well as every generous believer in international unity, must view with humiliation and chagrin.

The one thing that seems pretty clear in it all is that we are not "helping Russia" in any tangible way. Neither by letting Russia alone, on the one hand, nor by continuing an active discussion of intervention, on the other, is the United States, whose policy in these respects is also that of the Allies, contributing anything of great moment to the rebuilding of Russia or its restoration to a place of influence among the nations. For President Wilson's steadfast refusal to sanction forcible intervention in Russia there cannot be too high praise, but the longer continuance of a negative policy of official non-intercourse with the present Russian Government is bound to produce, in the thousands of Russia's friends in this country, a feeling of disappointment and apprehension. Russia needs help, not neglect. Mr. Wilson has clearly made known his desire to help, and with that desire the American people, we confidently believe, are in hearty accord. But are we helping Russia in any tangible and satisfactory way by merely letting it alone?

The alternative of recognition of the present Russian Government undoubtedly involves serious questions of fact as well as of policy. Yet the present diplomatic situation is anomalous—one might almost say ridiculous. At Washington, M. Bakmetiev is still referred to as the Russian Ambassador, and informally is treated as such; yet he appears to represent, if he represents anything, only the repudiated Kerensky régime. Mr. Francis, meantime, remains in Russia as American Ambassador, and from time to time appears to have some communication with the Soviet Government; but the United States declines to recognize that Government by any kind of official act. We have, in short, no diplomatic relations, of a sort to enable us to transact any political business, with the only Government actually operating in Russia, while at the same time we keep up the farce of extending a quasi-recognition to a former representative of a Russian Government which for months has been dead, and which there is small reason to believe will ever be resuscitated.

Under these circumstances, we cannot but think that the American public is entitled to know the reasons which, it must be assumed, have seemed to the Administration to dictate this policy of long-continued let alone. A careful study of newspaper reports from Russia during the past two or three months appears to indicate that the present Russian Government, in spite of the enormous difficulties of its position, is gaining in strength and solidity. Be that as it may, the facts of the Russian situation, whatever they are, ought to be known at Washington. If they are not known, no further time should be lost in getting them. And if they are known, they ought to be published, in order that the public may see and understand the reasons for a policy which apparently gives no help to Russia and brings no credit to the United States. The very fact that we have taken a firm stand against intervention makes it morally incumbent upon us to secure for Russia, in other ways, the moral and material support in the rehabilitation of its national life which the advocates of intervention loudly insist should be extended. We cannot do that by

treating as an outcast among the nations the only organized Government that Russia knows. The question of recognition is not one to be decided hastily, but it is also, we think, not one to be dodged. Sooner or later it will have to be met, and the answer ought to be given in the light of all the facts of the case. The thing to be sought first of all is the welfare of Russia; then, through a rejuvenated Russia, the defeat of Germany and the peace of the world. It is hard to see that, thus far, our policy towards Russia has done much for the attainment of either of those ends.

Royal Cohesion

WE are profoundly grateful to Emperor Charles for his suggestion that it is a time for kings to stick together. The Emperor has propounded ideas before that had our hearty sympathy, as when he sent Cousin Sixtus to President Poincaré with the suggestion that Germany return Alsace Lorraine to France and make a decent peace. But he has never enunciated a notion that had more useful possibilities than this one about the kings, and we trust that the world will make a note of it.

Most of the trouble in the past, so far as we can remember, has been due to the fact that the kings did not stick together. Away back in the beginnings of history the kings of Babylon and Assyria and Egypt were always lacking in unity, with the result that their people were forever going out and killing off one another by the thousand. In fact, the history books seem to be mostly filled with the quarrels of kings and emperors and czars and great moguls and other royal personages, and the battles that their subjects fought in consequence of their disagreements. As nearly as we can figure it, if the kings had just begun the process of sticking together right at the time the king business was established, it might have saved the world something like seventy-five thousand years of fighting more or less—no mean saving even in these days of considerable economies. Of course, there are persons who maintain that wars arise inevitably out of economic causes like the growth of population or trade rivalries, or that the nations catch the war fever sometimes just as children catch the measles, and that nobody is particularly to blame. But so far as we can make out, there has almost always been some king or archduke or potentate of some sort handy by, and he has always been able to show his subjects that it is more honorable for them to go out and kill some of the subjects of his fellow-king than for the two Supreme Highnesses to get together and settle the thing like gentlemen, or, at worst, like opponents in a law court. For instance, we don't believe that the Bagdad railway or the numerousness of German babies automatically made this present war. We have always had a suspicion that one Wilhelm Hohenzollern had something to do with it, and our suspicion has been much confirmed by a memorandum we read some time since written by Prince Lichnowsky. And so we say, if the kings had just stuck together, we have an idea that somehow the world would have found a way to get round the "inevitable" results of economic causes in the past; for as nearly as we can discover, most ordinary men prefer to sit on the front porch and play with the baby rather than do their duty toting a gun.

It is not of the past that we are thinking, however, when we refer to the possibilities that Charles the Sudden has

suggested with his happy phrase. Of course, it reminds us of Franklin's famous repartee at the signing of the Declaration of Independence, but the participants in that celebrated conversation were just plain American democrats and not kings, and in the present case it looks as though, after all, the kings might succeed longer in sticking separately than they could together. The Czar tumbled off his throne last year, but all the Central Emperors still stick. The trouble with the Bolsheviks was that they didn't understand the possibility of this separate sticking plan, and so thought that when the throne-upsetting industry was established in Russia, it would automatically spread to Germany and Austria. And so it would have done if the kings had been sticking together, as the inexperienced Karlchen would have them do. But as it was, Wilhelm and his partners were able to show their people that they were quite a different sort of kings from Nicholas; therefore, as he had been retired for the good of the service, they, of course, ought to be retained. And that view still holds in Central Europe we regret to say.

It is just here that Charles's suggestions will prove useful. We hold that the king business is a bad business, just like running a saloon, or operating a roulette wheel, or selling gold bricks. There are good kings and bad kings, to be sure, just as there are good and bad saloon-keepers and gamblers and gold-brick sellers. But we don't like the business either in the one case or in the other. And because we don't like the saloon business, we are going to get rid of it one of these days. If the saloon-keepers could just have got us to quarrelling over which ones of them were good and which bad, we might have let their business go on in definitely. Just so with the kings. So long as we let them persuade us that our king is good and the other people's king is bad, so long they can get us to keep on doing their business for them, and that business seems to be largely killing the other king's people. But if the kings will stick together, then we can turn attention to the business itself and once we really get to thinking about it, the kings may not last much longer than the saloons. It is not that we have any hostility to the kings, except the bad ones, any more than we have to the saloon-keepers. And we know that some of the kings do a lot of highly useful work, but so do the saloon-keepers. We are sure that if there were no saloon-keepers, some one else could be found to do the useful part of their work; and as for the kings, President Wilson has been doing the useful part of their work so much better than any of them that there is no need to argue the possibility there.

So let the kings stick together, and we will all do every thing we can to abolish them together, and get their work done by somebody else. But as they don't all stick together yet, we are bound to say that the two we are specially interested to see abolished right away are Wilhelm and Charles, and we are doing our level best to get them abolished. And if we don't succeed in getting the Germans and Austrians to agree with us on this point while the war lasts, perhaps when it's all done and they have had time to think it over, they will come to the conclusion that on the king question we were right, after all. Then they will abolish them themselves, and we sha'n't have to bother about it any more. And perhaps by that time there will be so few kings left that they won't make any more trouble; and so, after all, it won't make so much difference whether they stick together or not.

The Professor and the Law

ONE of the questions which have been all but completely ignored in recent discussions of academic freedom and tenure is that of the legal status of a professor. The famous report of Professor Seligman's committee, submitted at the second meeting of the American Association of University Professors, barely alluded to the subject; and the numerous subsequent reports made to the Association on specific cases of violation of professorial privilege, while in some instances suggesting that legal rights had been trespassed upon, have refrained from pressing the point. The somewhat voluminous magazine and newspaper literature to which the issue of academic freedom has given birth, for the most part ignores the legal aspect of the case altogether, save as trustees or their defenders have here or there urged the complete legal authority of a governing board over a university and its faculty. What has been dwelt upon, chiefly, is the assumed moral right of a professor to freedom of speech or permanency of tenure, or the alleged violations of propriety on the part of presidents or governing boards in dismissing some who exercised it.

The question offers a fruitful field for investigation, not only to lawyers, but to professors themselves. So far as we are aware, the nature of the legal relations which exist between a professor and the institution which he serves has never been comprehensively examined. There is, we believe, no legal treatise on the subject. The reason, presumably, is that questions of legal claim or responsibility have rarely been pressed in professorial controversies. In the whole matter of the legal status of professors and faculties, most American colleges and universities are monuments of informality and disorder. Appointments and promotions often rest upon mutual understanding or agreement, without written offer or acceptance, and with no specific indication of duties to be performed or restrictions to be observed. Regulations governing the admission of students, the course of study, the attainment of degrees, and the grant of financial aid are made and unmade by presidents, faculties, and governing boards, with more or less complete indifference to such questions as usurpation of authority on the one hand or infringement of rights on the other. It would be no easy task to determine, in many of the everyday relations of academic life, whether a president or a professor, in a given case, was legally authorized to do what he is doing, or was doing what he was legally required to do.

Yet it cannot need demonstration that the professor has both legal rights and legal obligations. However informal the professor's status, however much in practice is left to custom, the status is nevertheless contractual as well as moral. It may be that the full round of professorial duties cannot well be indicated with exactness or in advance, that attendance upon faculty and committee meetings, or the performance of endless clerical service, are to be regarded as "going with the job," or that the special character of his student audience imposes upon him some reasonable restriction in speech or conduct. Such things may, perhaps, be taken for granted. But there are other matters which do not need to be, and should not be, left to the loosenesses of a good-natured understanding. A professor is entitled to his salary, if he has performed the duties which he has been asked to perform, and to a pension if he has fulfilled the conditions which make him eligible. He has a right to en-

gage in any occupation not inconsistent with the performance of his professorial duties, provided he has made no agreement to the contrary. He does not cease to be a citizen by becoming a professor, but may still speak, write, vote, or act in any political matter with the same freedom which any other citizen enjoys, and without being put in jeopardy, in reputation, tenure, or pay, because of what he may say or do. And he has the same right as others enjoy to order his intellectual and spiritual life, to champion new ideas or oppose them, to observe the conventions or disregard them, so long as he does not, in the opinion of competent and impartial judges, wreck his usefulness as a professor or violate the law. These things are not rights to be calmly exercised, as matters of course, by business men, lawyers, or politicians who sit on governing boards, and at the same time haughtily denied to university professors. They are the common rights of men and women in every enlightened society, and are neither waived nor impaired by reason of a contract, expressed or implied, to perform service as a university teacher. And if they are infringed, in any way whatever, by presidents or trustees, on the plea that their exercise is inconsistent with the holding of a professor's chair, the burden of proof is upon the officials who are guilty of the infringement, and the professor is entitled to seek redress at law.

There can be no need to state again the arguments on behalf of academic freedom, or the desirability of wide public discussion of the matter whenever such freedom is denied or threatened. We think that the time has come, however, when professors whose academic rights have been interfered with should take their cases into court. Investigations such as the American Association of University Professors has made are useful so far as they go; but so long as the Association contents itself with investigation, and offers no further aid to those of its members whose professional careers are jeopardized, there is little to hope for from that quarter. Presidents and governing boards have taken the measure of the Association and appear to have concluded that it is negligible.

What the American academic world now needs is judicial determination of a professor's rights. If a professor, by entering the service of a university, loses thereby some of the rights in law which would otherwise be his, the fact ought to be known. If presidents and trustees are exercising usurped powers unsustainable by any law, the sooner the courts are given a chance to call them to account the better. The experience of the Association of Professors has made it clear that the battle for intellectual and moral freedom in the universities is not to be won merely by publicity. It will be won only when those who suffer legal injury invoke the law for the safeguarding of their rights.

We are, of course, aware that in suggesting that professors take their grievances to the courts we are urging a course which not only involves financial expense of a serious sort, but which also invites a kind and measure of publicity peculiarly repugnant to the academic habit of mind. Cases of so-called "academic freedom," however, get a good deal of newspaper publicity now, and the odium of it, if it be felt as odium, would at least not be added to if it were made clear that a professor, in resorting to the law, was only fighting for his rights. As to the question of expense, that, it seems to us, is a matter in which the Association of Professors might well interest itself to supplement, if necessary, the financial resources of its members.

The Child-Labor Decision

By THOMAS REED POWELL

FIVE judges of the Supreme Court have declared the Federal Child Labor law unconstitutional. By the most tenuous margin possible, the statute of Congress is destroyed. The law thus annulled by the vote of a single judge did not forbid the employment of children. It prohibited the shipment across State lines of goods from factories where children worked. Manufacturers whose goods were sold only in their home State were immune from its terms. If they sold only to their neighbors and disobeyed no law of their State, they were free from legal fault.

The opinion of the majority does not hint that the Constitution secures to employers the right to use the labor of children. The due-process clause, which covers such a multitude of complaints, is no shield against laws which keep children under fourteen from the factory, or which guard them for two years longer from toiling and spinning more than eight hours a day. The act of Congress was not found to offend because it invaded any liberty of employers or of children. Its fault was the more grievous one that it encroached upon the reserved powers of the States.

These reserved powers are the ones possessed before the Constitution made a nation out of a congeries of sovereign commonwealths. The position of the majority of the court is justified only if a State, before the Constitution, had power to compel the reception of its goods by its neighbors. For Congress interfered with no possible law of a State except one which would exact an open door to markets without its borders. Mr. Justice Holmes in his dissent puts the point with his accustomed clarity:

The act does not meddle with anything belonging to the States. They may regulate their internal affairs and their domestic commerce as they like. But when they seek to send their products across the State line they are no longer within their rights. If there were no Constitution and no Congress their power to cross the line would depend upon their neighbors. Under the Constitution such commerce belongs, not to the States, but to Congress, to regulate. It may carry out its views of public policy whatever indirect effect they may have upon the activities of the States. Instead of being encountered by a prohibitive tariff at her boundaries, the State encounters the public policy of the United States which it is for Congress to express.

And to reason we may add authority. For the first time in its history the court holds that a prohibition of transportation across State lines is not a regulation of interstate commerce. Many times it has annulled State interferences with such transportation, branding them the exercise of a power which the Constitution by conferring upon Congress had denied to the States. Yet a law which regulates interstate commerce when passed by a State is now held not to regulate such commerce when enacted by Congress. By such nimble metamorphosis the Supreme Court has created a vacuum in legislative power. It found no such vacuum when Congress forbade the transit across State lines of lottery tickets, alcoholic drinks, and impure foods, and restrained men and women on interstate errands of vice. The barriers thus erected were held not to invade any reserved powers of the States. Justice Holmes paints the contrast when he says: "It is not for this court to pronounce when prohibition is necessary to regulation, if ever it may

be necessary—to say that it is permissible as against strong drink, but not as against the product of ruined lives."

Though the majority declare that "the act in its effect does not regulate transportation among the States," they must mean this in some Pickwickian sense. Congress prohibited such transportation, and prohibition has long been regarded as regulation. "Regulation means the prohibition of something," says Justice Holmes, in reminding the majority of the precedents which have sustained Congressional prohibitions. The genuine issue in the case is best stated by the minority. "No one is likely to dispute," it says, "that the statute in question is within the power expressly given to Congress, if considered only as to its immediate effect." If it is invalid, "it is so only upon some collateral ground." This collateral ground, on which the majority proceed, is that the effect of the prohibition is to regulate manufacture, and that regulation of manufacture is not for Congress, but for the States.

The answer is simple. Regulation of manufacture is the necessary indirect result of all prohibitions of transportation. Less liquor is distilled, if liquor cannot be shipped across State lines. Some packing houses will be cleaned up, if impure foods cannot enter the channels of interstate trade. The world is so full of a number of things, and they are all so joined together, that we can seldom stir one and leave the rest unmoved. A regulation of interstate commerce is still a regulation of interstate commerce, although it affects something else as well. To assert the contrary is to invoke an artificial scission of what never was disjoined on sea or land. If the Constitution meant Congress, when regulating interstate commerce, to suffer the limitations of the player at jackstraws, it bound it by conditions which in larger part emasculate the power granted. It took away with one hand what it gave with the other. Under this interpretation, the Constitution said to Congress: "You may levy an excise tax on liquor and put tariffs on imports, but you must not thereby collaterally affect manufacture, for that is for the States. You may regulate the traffic that crosses State lines, but you shall not in so doing interfere with any desires of producers to enjoy that traffic on such terms as they will. The pound of flesh is yours, but not one drop of blood."

It is difficult to accept such a theory of the impotence of national authority. It may be true, as the majority insist, that previous Congressional prohibitions of transportation have been designed to prevent evils to consumers. But it is a far cry from Congressional inaction to constitutional impotence. A court which professes never to question the motives of a Legislature can hardly declare that Congress has exceeded its power because it has prevented transportation which fosters and stimulates a menace to producers rather than to consumers.

The power of the producing State is no more interfered with by the Child Labor law than by the Pure Food law. Neither prohibits anything but interstate transportation. Both equally induce manufacturers from motives of gain to modify practices which they will not abandon from motives of humanity. But those who yield to the inducement and voluntarily indulge in human decency do no more than they

were free to do before Congress acted. Their new adventures in respectability violate no command of their State nor any shadow of potential State authority. The virtuous practices to which Congress entices them are practices which the States could not forbid. Underlying the opinion of the majority is the unconscious acceptance of the Austinian notion that what the State permits, it commands. However elevating the notion may be to the flights of abstract jurisprudence, it has no place in the application of constitutional limitations. Many acts of individuals which States do not forbid are acts which they would be powerless to command. Statutes compelling unsanitary conditions or debilitating labor of children would find the Fourteenth Amendment a bar. The only State power over manufacture inhibited by the Child Labor law is one that the Constitution itself would forbid the State to exercise. Congress has not relieved the manufacturer from any command of his State. It has not forbidden any act which his State sanctions. Manufacturing may go on as before, if manufacturers so desire. But the goods which they wish to ship to other States must be made in factories which do not menace the health and strength of the future men and women of the nation. The alleged State power interfered with is a power never possessed—a claimed authority to prescribe what shall be carried beyond its dominions. What Congress really interfered with was the desire of manufacturers to sap the life blood of the nation.

When judges disagree, it cannot be invidious to all of them to suggest that some of them are in error. At no point in the Child Labor case do the majority of the court meet the particular contentions of the minority. In the sentence which comes closest to explaining the decision, the point at issue is assumed. The majority say:

The far-reaching result of upholding the act cannot be more plainly indicated than by pointing out that if Congress can thus regulate matters entrusted to local authority by prohibition of the movement of commodities in interstate commerce, all freedom of commerce will be at an end, and the power of the States over local matters eliminated, and thus our system of government be practically destroyed.

But the power of the States which the Child Labor law eliminated was not over local matters, but over interstate matters. Matters entrusted to local authority were left untouched. If, indeed, by judicial decision the States can dictate that certain articles shall be carried across the continent, and Congress is powerless to interfere, our system of government is already measurably altered. The fear, moreover, that Congress may in its unwisdom end all freedom of commerce is groundless, so long as the due-process clause continues to restrain legislation which lacks the justifications that due process prescribes. The fact that power may be abused is no argument against its existence.

The reader who has persevered thus far must pardon the technical treatment, for the problem is a technical one. The decision seems due to the disregard of controlling technical considerations and to the entertainment of a vague fear of what Congress may do with its power over transportation. But we must bow to the decision until it is overruled. If we wish to continue the Federal system, it is idle and foolish to talk of withdrawing the power of the Supreme Court to project the lines of the Constitution which vaguely point to the boundaries between State and national authority. Some one outside of Congress and the State Legislatures must determine their respective provinces. Courts

must be manned by judges who are fallible, as their decisions must be discussed by fallible critics. Yet the gravity of reversing the judgment of the elected representatives and the Chief Executive of the nation is such that a court might well hesitate to reverse it by the casting vote of a single judge. Often the court tells us that it must uphold a statute unless its unconstitutionality is free from doubt. These professions would have gained in dignity if the certitude of four of the judges that the Child Labor law is constitutional had been allowed to suggest to their five colleagues that its unconstitutionality is not free from doubt.

There can be little question that the views of the minority will in time prevail. Decisions which are out of joint with the times, which are not required by any clear mandate of the Constitution, and which meet with strong dissent from some of the ablest of the judges, are not likely long to remain unmodified. The history of the Supreme Court shows that minorities often persist in their dissent and not infrequently become a majority. The decision denying the power of Congress to make greenbacks legal tender survived but a year. The famous *Bake-shop* case, which annulled a ten-hour law for bakers, died after a decade. These may ere long be joined, in the limbo of rejected doctrines, by the Child Labor decision.

Meanwhile, those who believe that the nation should exercise its undoubted powers to the end of promoting the national welfare, wherever that welfare is threatened, will be seeking other avenues to the goal. The suggestion has been made that Congress should close the channels of interstate commerce to the products of child labor as the Webb-Kenyon law closed them to intoxicants, making the prohibition dependent upon the concurring action of the State of destination. But with such a statute before them, the present majority of the Supreme Court may easily persist in their distinction that prohibition of transportation is not an exercise of commerce power unless the transportation can be an instrument of danger at the end of the journey. If Congress, however, should impose a special excise on making goods with the labor of children, the Supreme Court could not defeat its purpose without directly abandoning the case which sustained the excise on oleomargarine. In that case the present Chief Justice declared that the motives or purposes of Congress were not open to judicial inquiry, and that the law was not invalid because its effect might be to suppress manufacture.

The Supreme Court has appreciated the wisdom of not annulling an undoubted exercise of the Federal taxing power because of its necessary collateral effects. While reason and previous authority seem to militate as strongly in favor of disregarding the necessary collateral effects of undoubted exercises of the commerce power, it must be assumed for the present that there is some vital distinction between the two. Until that assumption is no longer necessary, those who believe that the nation should use its power to end the evils which harm the nation must look to the taxing power of Congress. And when in the future the taxing power is thus employed, it is to be hoped that an undivided court will accept and apply the closing sentences of Mr. Justice Holmes's dissenting opinion in the Child Labor case: "The national welfare as understood by Congress may require a different attitude within its sphere from that of some self-seeking State. It seems to me entirely constitutional for Congress to enforce its understanding by all the means at its command."

A University in a University Court

By CENSOR PEREGRINUS

THE University of Nebraska, thrust by circumstances into a complex of difficulties, has performed a unique, indeed, an heroic, experiment in college government. The Regents of the University have resolved themselves into a court for the public trial of a group of professors formally charged by the State Council of Defence with failing to do their duty in time of war, and in sessions held almost daily during a period of two weeks (May 28-June 11) they have listened to testimony and heard argument touching the accused. The court has been open to the public and to the press, and the names not only of the twelve employees mentioned in the charges of the State Council, but also those of six others introduced during the sessions, have been telegraphed to all parts of the United States as the names of persons held suspect, in so far as the charges so make them.

This alone is a situation of great dramatic and public interest, but its significance is vastly enhanced by the social background of the action and the events which have created it. The issue is ostensibly, and to some extent really, the performance of duty in the hour of war by the accused. But in order to define this duty it has been deemed necessary to probe the "mental attitude" of the accused and the "mental atmosphere" of the University; to which end testimony has been admitted concerning the opinions of the accused with regard to the war in Europe from its beginning in 1914, with regard to "internationalism" and "pacifism," to the I. W. W., to the obligations of capital and labor, to political affiliations, to vocational versus liberal education, to freedom of speech, and, by no means least in significance, to academic responsibility. Such testimony could not be given without putting the University as an institution on trial; and the University has been on trial before the people of Nebraska.

Moreover, it is not merely the accused and the University that are before the people; the court and the accusers are in a similar position. The Regents instituted the court in response to repeated challenges from the State Council; it is the public reply of one official State body to the public charges of another such body, with the obvious implication that the State shall decide between them. This is more than a formal matter, for the State Council has addressed, within the year, demands to the Board of Regents with respect to their own conduct towards one of their number; and certain journals, which may reasonably be said to reflect the opinion of the State Council, since their owners are members of the Council, have for a full year kept the University under a fire of criticism. It is by no means impossible that some political differences are semi-conscious in the whole affair; for while both bodies are formally bipartisan, the political situation in Nebraska is unquestionably in a mood of reconstruction: the political game is submerged by a rapidly changing social consciousness, other issues than party affiliations determining men's sympathies. Certain it is that it would be a rash and inconsiderate judgment which would ascribe other than the most intense earnestness to all factions concerned, though in equal measure it would be difficult to find simplicity of motive. Men are moved by many anxieties: anxiety as to their duty as officers; anxiety as to the needs of the State and the needs

of the nation; anxiety as to the rights of individuals, in the present hour and for future hours; and some anxiety, assuredly, for the reputation of Nebraska among her fellow States.

The Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska is composed of six members directly elected (two at each biennial election) for a term of six years. They serve without pay. On the present board are three merchants, two bankers, and one farmer; all but one hold either an academic or a professional degree (two from the University of Nebraska), and the children of three or four have attended or graduated from the University. It is a general opinion that the Board represents a high order of competency, and is sensitive to its responsibilities both to the State and to the employees of the institution in its charge. Legally the Board has complete control of the University, subject to legislative appropriations; actually the University has, in the main, been governed after the fashion of most American colleges, its Chancellor serving as the adviser of the Board and the representative of the faculty. This situation, with the Chancellor standing, as it were, between the Regents and the faculty, has made relatively easy the assumption on the part of the Board of the character of a court before which members of the faculty should appear. Perhaps the only distinction of the experiment is the formality and publicity of its hearings.

In the court as held only five of the six Regents have appeared on the bench, and it is generally believed that the sixth Regent is not participating in the counsels of the Board. This sixth Regent, whose term of office is near expiration, as early as 1914 published a plea for the German cause and a condemnation of the Allies and of American sympathy with the Allies. He also wrote a letter (which later became public) bitterly criticising a professor in the University who openly condemned Germany. Later, a series of letters appeared in the *Omaha World-Herald*, over the signature "Patricia Newcomb," lauding German conduct in the war and assailing American sentiment and institutions. In the summer of 1917 the *Omaha Nebraskan* accused Regent Haller of being author of the "Patricia Newcomb" letters, sustaining the accusation with evidence drawn from comparison with the signed letter. The proof was accepted by other journals, and the charge has not (to the writer's best belief) been denied. The matter was in public controversy for months, and in the course of this the State Council demanded of the Regents that they remove Regent Haller from the position of president of the Board, which he then held (his resignation from office was called for by the press and by petition). However, Regent Haller continued in office until the end of the year. The incident has no direct bearing upon this trial except to show why the Regents have not sat in full body and why they are themselves in a defensive attitude before the people of the State.

The Nebraska State Council of Defence is a body appointed by the Governor under an act of the Legislature shortly after the declaration of war by the United States. As early as July, 1917, this body addressed the Board of Regents stating that there were in the University "several professors . . . out of harmony with the American cause."

The affair of the "Patricia Newcomb" letters became public soon after this, absorbing much journalistic interest; and it was not until April 19, 1918, that the Council again addressed the Regents relative to University professors, stating that "during the past ten months many reports and complaints have reached the State Council of Defence with regard to the un-American attitude of persons connected with the University," and calling upon the Regents for "instant action." At their ensuing meeting, April 25, the Regents replied with a letter offering a public hearing, asking the Council to submit there any evidence in their possession against any University employee, and promising summarily to dismiss any person "shown to have said, taught, or advised anything which can fairly be said to interfere in any way with the carrying on of the struggle in which the country is engaged, or to have given aid or comfort to its enemies at home or abroad, or whose behavior is negative, halting, or hesitating in support of the Government." To this the Council did not reply until May 20, when it submitted charges against twelve employees of the University, most of them professors, the complaint reading: "We herewith transmit to you complaints involving the attitude of twelve instructors. We do not charge all of these instructors with treason. We do not say that they have all made themselves liable even to the Sedition law. It is not necessary that a person be proved guilty of treason or sedition to show him unfit as an instructor. The fact, as you so aptly suggest in your letter of April 25, 1918, that he is 'negative, halting, or hesitating in the support of the Government,' disqualifies him." The communication gave in detail the character of the charges against the accused; their names, however, were not given out. In a further paragraph the decision of Judge Mullen, of New York, relative to a Columbia University student, was approvingly quoted to the effect that it is a function of the college "to instil and sink deep in the minds of its students the love of truth and the love of country." The question of academic responsibility was thus definitely raised.

The Regents replied to this by organizing themselves into a trial court, which began its sessions May 28. In this court the president of the Board of Regents sat as presiding judge, his colleagues as associates. A professor of the Law School acted as "manager"—virtually as prosecuting attorney in those cases where the defence had legal representatives. The State Council was represented by two prominent attorneys; six of the twelve accused were represented by attorney. The manager laid down as rules of procedure: (1) that his duties were those of a conductor of an investigation, not a prosecutor; (2) that the charge was disloyalty, and that evidence not in the charges submitted would be considered; (3) that the public were invited to bring forward any evidence of disloyalty in the University which they might possess; (4) that evidence concerning facts precedent to the entry of the United States into the war would be received only when they tended to throw light on the subsequent conduct of the accused; (5) that the accused could submit evidence as to their own conduct in other matters than the incidents of the accusation; (6) that full cross-examination should be allowed; (7) that organizations might be permitted to furnish evidence; (8) that the rules of evidence as laid down by the courts would in general be enforced, especially as to the exclusion of hearsay; (9) that in case of necessity the State Council would be requested to exercise its power to subpoena witnesses; and (10) that as far as possible the

Board would protect from unjust consequences all employees of the University and all students testifying.

The object of this form of procedure and of these rules was very clearly to emphasize to the public the thoroughness and fairness with which the Board of Regents was prepared to conduct the investigation, and this attitude was recognized and approved by the leading journals of the State. As a matter of fact, in the conduct of the trial, the prosecution was continually allowed privileges which were denied, or granted only in a restricted degree, to the defence. Indeed, the court openly stated that it did not feel justified in sustaining any objection brought by the defence against questions asked by the attorneys representing the State Council, and it was affirmed by the manager that the attorneys of the Council were not to be regarded "in the same light, as to privilege, as those of the defence." The obvious intention of all these precautions was to insure the Board against criticism of partiality for the accused.

The charges preferred by the State Council form a lengthy document, the salient points of which may be summarized. In the cases of five instructors the main or important charge was of sympathy with the I. W. W., "an organization that is practically at war with America," or with "internationalism," which the manager interpreted as meaning the doctrine of equality of duty of a man towards his fellows, irrespective of their nationality. In two or three cases the instructor's attitude towards solicitors for Liberty Bonds or thrift stamp purchases was in question; and in one case the main accusation rested upon the instructor's criticism of the conduct of some of his colleagues in patriotic activities. In virtually all other instances the charge rested upon utterances, or alleged utterances, relative to the war; among them "extolling German prowess," justifying the German invasion of Belgium, disbelieving in German atrocities, and denying that the United States had sufficient cause for entering the war. In two instances the accusations involved the issue of free speech, the accused instructors having in each case stood for the rights of another to be heard in self-explanation before being condemned for unpatriotic expression. It should be observed that, while in one or two cases instructors were charged with pernicious classroom utterances, the specific charges all had to do with expressions of opinion, public and private, outside the classroom: the professor was on trial not as an instructor, but as a citizen.

Testimony was heard on nine days, seven to nine hours per day. During this period, owing to the Regents' open invitation to the public to bring forward information, the names of six persons connected with the University were added to the original twelve. Also during this period the charges against eight were dropped, with the consent of the attorneys for the State Council, as being utterly without support. On the third day of the session one of the Council's attorneys stated in court that the charges against the professors did not extend to disloyalty, that the only charge was of "negative, halting, or hesitating conduct" in support of the war, and that this charge was maintained in view of the duty of a university instructor to display a more aggressive patriotism than is demanded of the unofficial citizen. In regard to the I. W. W., the testimony showed that none of the accused possessed either much information about the organization or a pronounced interest in it. As a matter of fact, this organization hardly affects Nebraska, the city of Lincoln in particular being notably free from its influences. Curiosity had been expressed about it (wholly

in private conversations), especially in connection with newspaper reports of the deportations. "Internationalism" was conceded in the sense of a belief in a league of nations and again as a broad conception of human duty; one man was a "conscientious objector" to the use of force; another had been a strong promoter of pacifism for many years; several had, by a joint message to Nebraska Congressmen, favored the maintenance of armed neutrality rather than the entrance of the United States into the war. All, however, once war was declared, had accepted the issue and actively supported the Government. The other charges, almost without exception, proved to be the result of petty misunderstandings, excited imaginations, and inflated gossip. In all cases the accused were men of pronouncedly democratic opinions, and in nearly every case their teaching and expression had been the opposite of that ascribed to them. All who were seriously accused had performed services helpful to the country, in several cases involving considerable sacrifices. In fact, at the close of the testimony, it was a common opinion of those who had followed it that only in three cases could the attorneys for the accusation even argue for a "negative, halting, or hesitating" attitude. These three were the "conscientious objector" (engaged in significant food conservation work); the theoretical pacifist, who appears to have some difficulty in adjusting his philosophy to the fact of war (which, nevertheless, he has supported, having a son in the service); and the professor who ill-manneredly criticised his colleagues in April, 1917 (although about the same time he himself endeavored to enlist, failing because of physical disability). The investigation has proved the entire loyalty of the University of Nebraska.

In the final argument this was essentially conceded by the attorneys for the prosecution. There was no man in the University, it was said, who would in any positive fashion fail in his obligations to his country, or, if there were such failure, it was failure to come forward emphatically when the occasion was presented—a failure in "aggressive patriotism." Here again the issue of academic responsibility was to the fore: a State institution, above all in the stress of war, demands of its servants not only that they be correct as citizens, but that they be enthusiastic as patriots, in the classroom and before the public; anything short of this is "negative, hesitating, and halting conduct."

At this writing the verdict of the judges has not been given. But it is clear that the Regents are confronted with a delicate problem; on the one hand, their conception of the rights of the accused and of a justice which must be decided by other than legal standards; on the other, their sense of responsibility to the nation, the State, and the University. It is obvious that whatever the decision, if it penalize any employee of the University, there will be no reflection upon his character as a loyal American, but only upon his powers of judgment in a time of stress. Nor has the trial brought out anything finer than the instructions of two of the defendants to their attorney to consider in his argument, first, the interests of the nation at war; second, the interests of the University; and only third, the question of justice to themselves.

The record of the University of Nebraska in the present war is cleared of the imputation of disloyalty, but it remains to show why the institution should have been brought under suspicion by an official body and subjected to charges which can only affect injuriously the reputation of the University within the State, and of the State of Nebraska with-

in the Union. This is no simple problem, for the hour is everywhere one of great social complexity; certain indications, however, are palpable.

Unquestionably, the foremost factor in the situation is the nervousness of the public mind. The news for months has been laden with spyings and accusations, and it is a commonplace of observation that the atmosphere of the hour is one of jealous suspicion. The fact that public opinion was radically divided on the matter of our national policy before our entrance into the war, and the stress of anxiety occasioned by our participation in the struggle, necessarily enhance jealousies and breed imaginings: the barometric pressure favors hysterical outbursts. In the Nebraska case, the State Council made itself the formal transmitter of the suspicion of the public; and if any deduction is to be drawn from its part in the affair, it is that such Councils should be directed only by men of legal training and judicial mind.

That the suspicion should attach itself to the University is partly due to the fact that University instructors are public employees, and that they must necessarily discuss national and international issues. But in the Nebraska case there are other factors. The University has been before the public, in the matter of the war, since September, 1914. In the early period several professors (representing a distinct minority) came out strongly and publicly for the cause of the Allies. They were subjected to severe criticism by the German-American Alliance (formally), by the German press, and by a part of the English press. This was accompanied by threats such that Chancellor Avery felt called upon to come out with a clear proclamation of the rights of academic freedom of speech. Public opinion has shifted ground since 1914, and the issue now felt is that of academic responsibility to the State.

Furthermore, as the testimony showed, there are internal differences within the University which antedate even the European war and are yet represented in the differing attitudes of the professors. Broadly, these differences might be described as lying between the radically democratic group, having a strong sympathy for labor parties and (curiously enough) for vocationalism in education, and the party favoring liberal education. The former University group was in the main opposed to American entrance into the war; the latter favored it. Certainly this intra-university grouping represents a division that to some extent exists outside the University; and perhaps the most dramatic incident of the investigation was the deliberate criticism of the University, by one of the professors accused, as being governed by a group of "intellectual aristocrats" to the detriment of the interests of the people of the State. This professor is firm in the belief that we are on the verge of a class conflict which will result in the elimination of the College of Liberal Arts.

In the minds of many observers party politics is held partly responsible for the situation. This is possible, but not at all obvious—not nearly so obvious as that certain journalists have been carried away by a love of sensationalism and have thrown caution to the winds in their dissemination of rumor. The net result has been to give a cruel publicity to the names of men without reason suspected of disloyalty to their country. Nevertheless, even this evil may prove to have more than its compensation in the institution among American colleges of the forms of open and public hearing for employees whose discretion or qualifications have been brought into question.

Growing Older

By MARIE EMILIE GILCHRIST

GRAY days and gold, in serried ranks they tread
The shadowy way that leads to long ago;
Intent upon a goal we may not know
They take the way that centuries have led.
And once I sought to hold them as they sped
Rapt pilgrims, questing to Eternity—
Or urged them on with sorrow-stricken plea
That in their flight I might be comforted.
But now I care not how the days go by:
Although the fairest dawns may flush and fade,
There's always beauty in the vaulted sky,
And where there's beauty, who can be afraid?
The earth is good, in laughter and in tears—
May God go with you, friendly stranger years.

Some Unpublished Commentaries of George Ripley

By THEODORE STANTON

LAST summer, when I published in the *Nation* some account of the books once belonging to George Ripley and now deposited in the town library of Agen, I mentioned the fact that several of these volumes are plainly the very ones used by him in preparing his reviews for the *New York Tribune*, where he was long the literary editor. Among these is a copy of John Fiske's "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy," with not a few lead-pencil notes jotted down on the margin of the pages as he read them. The recently published "Life and Letters of Fiske," by John Spencer Clark, reviewed in the *Nation* last January, may give some interest to the presentation of these Fiske Ripleyana now lying buried in a provincial town of the south of France.

On p. 161, Vol. I, Fiske says:

The attempt to detect the *occulta vis* or hidden energy in the act of causation is but the fruitless attempt to bind in the chains of some thinkable formula that universal Protean Power, of whose multitudinous effects we are cognizant in the sequence of phenomena, but which in its secret nature must ever mockingly elude our grasp.

Beginning with "Protean Power," Ripley underlines this passage and then adds in pencil at the foot of the page: "Not an admirable object of religious reverence."

In characterizing the Idealism of Berkeley as "contrary to our ineradicable belief in the existence of something independent of ourselves," Fiske says, p. 74, Vol. I:

What Berkeley really denied was the scholastic theory of occult substrata underlying each group of phenomena. In this denial we maintain that he was right; but his denial was made in such wise as to ignore the fact of an Absolute Existence of which phenomena are the manifestations, and herein, we maintain, was his fundamental error.

To this foot-note Ripley adds these words: "No; with Berkeley the Absolute Existence was God."

On p. 260, Vol. I, Fiske says:

His (Comte's) aims were as practical as those of Saint Simon and Fourier, the difference being chiefly that these unscientific dreamers built their utopias upon abstract theories of human nature, while Comte sought to found his polity upon the scien-

tific study of actual tendencies of humanity as determined by its past history.

Ripley underlines Fourier and "abstract theories of human nature," and, Brook Farmer that he still was at heart, naturally puts in the margin a big negative with an exclamation mark, "NO!"

"Spiritualism" is simply one of the weeds which spring up in minds uncultivated by science," writes Fiske, p. 379, Vol. II. Ripley is not so sure about this, and so marks this passage and puts a point of interrogation in the margin.

Of "anthropomorphic theism," Fiske says, pp. 408-9, Vol. II:

Our choice . . . lies between a limited Deity and one that is without limit. . . . Personality and Infinity are terms expressive of ideas which are mutually incompatible.

Across the bottom of these two pages Ripley writes:

Individuality results from the division of Unity = $\frac{1}{2} : \frac{1}{3} : \frac{1}{4}$, and so on, the fraction decreasing in value with the increase of the denominator; thence Unity divided by zero is Infinity, $\frac{1}{0} = \infty$. Therefore Infinity cannot be Individuality.

On p. 423, Vol. II, Fiske says:

In the pantheistic hypothesis the distinction between absolute and phenomenal existence is ignored, and the world of phenomena is practically identified with Deity.

Here Ripley underlines "absolute" and "phenomenal," and again puts a question mark in the margin.

In the paragraph on p. 90, Vol. I, where Fiske considers "Absolute Existence," Ripley underlines several phrases and makes three marginal marks on passages, and then writes these words at the bottom of the page: "This applies to the Unconscious of Hartmann," the reference being to the German philosopher, Eduard von Hartmann (1842-1906).

Frothingham, in his "Life of George Ripley," p. 51, tells us that Ripley read with great interest Hartmann's "Philosophy of the Unconscious," making notes as he read. "These notes contain evidence, less in the form of actual expression than in the selection of passages quoted, of his adherence to the intuitive system of thought."

In fact, Hartmann's name appears not infrequently in these Agen notes. Thus this phrase, "unconscious intention according to Hartmann," has been written on the page immediately opposite the first page of the text of Joseph Cook's "Biology," in the "Boston Monday Lectures" (Boston, 1877), under the second motto from Huxley, where Ripley underlines the whole of the third sentence and then writes: "The phenomena of the universe are evolved from the primordial molecular arrangement, in accordance with its inherent nature." The Huxley sentence, just mentioned, as underlined by Ripley, runs as follows: "The teleologist can always defy the evolutionist to disprove that the primordial molecular arrangement was not intended to evolve the phenomena of the universe."

At this time Joseph Cook attracted considerable attention. At the end of Lecture V, entitled "Living Things," Ripley has written these lines:

Cook will not be thought to do service to religion by explaining the miraculous conception of Christ on the principle of natural law. It would seem that the fact affirmed in the New Testament, that Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost, has no analogy with the fact in natural history that certain insects are born without two parents. If the conception of Christ was natural, or had its analogy in nature, it ceases to be supernatural and loses its value as a miracle. If Christ was born under the same law as that of virginal birth in the insect world, he was

born of a woman without a father, and the function of the Holy Ghost, as described by the evangelist, is set aside. The truth is the spheres of the natural and the supernatural are so entirely distinct that no conclusion can be drawn from one to the other. If the supernatural finds its counterpart in the natural it loses its supernatural character, and Mr. Cook's reasoning, accordingly, is not only fallacious, but suicidal.

In Lecture VII, "Does Death End All?" Cook quotes Agassiz as saying:

The products of merely physical forces are the same in all quarters of the globe, and during all time known to man; but the products of the forces that produce life are varied under the same circumstances. Between two such sets of forces there can be no causal or genetic connection.

Ripley writes: "All this is Hartmannisch."

In Oliver Wendell Holmes's Phi Beta Kappa oration—"Mechanism in Thought and Morals"—delivered at Harvard in 1870—occurs this passage:

The automatic flow of thought is often singularly favored by the fact of listening to a weak, continuous discourse, with just enough ideas in it to keep the mind busy on something else.

In the margin opposite, Ripley writes these two names: "Dr. Abiel Holmes and Ed. Everett." The first, the father of Oliver Wendell Holmes, was a clergyman, who preached at Cambridge while Ripley was a student there, and who was probably a prosy one, at least in the opinion of the undergraduate.

On the fly-leaf opposite the title-page of this same oration, Ripley has jotted down this philosophical table:

January 27, 1878: "Plastic Nature." 1. God Matter. Plato, Aristotle, Empedocles, Cudworth, Bascom. 2. God Mind. Leibniz, Kant, Sir W. Hamilton, Laycock, Carpenter, O. W. Holmes. 3. God, Mind and Matter. Cudworth, Hartmann, Laycock.

Many of the presentation copies in the Agen collection also show Ripley's "special liking for philosophical and psychological works," as Frothingham remarks. Thus, Maudsley's "Body and Mind," 1870, is replete with marks and underlinings. Laycock's "Mind and Brain," Edinburgh, 1860, has been read. John Bascom's "Comparative Psychology," Putnam, 1878, which was reviewed in the *Tribune* at about this time, has been very carefully studied, many passages being underlined or marked at the side, while the lead-pencil is very generous in notes. Thus, in the chapter on Vegetable Life, where the author gives examples of "vegetable digestion," Ripley asks: "Which is more difficult, to admit these acts of vegetable life without intelligence, or to admit intelligence without consciousness?" On p. 135: "If sensation can be without consciousness, why not thought?" On p. 147: "Instinct is acting for an end of which the agent is not conscious."

Among these presentation copies of philosophical works, one is especially interesting because of the men who have had it on their library shelves. I refer to the Agen copy of the "History of Modern Philosophy," by J. D. Morell, London, 1847. On the blank leaf opposite the title-page is written: "George Ripley from Henry James" (the father of the novelist), and across the title-page of the first volume runs this line: "Henry James, Esq., from James John Garth Wilkinson," the latter being the once well-known British disciple and translator of Swedenborg. He lived in this country at one time when he and the elder James became fast friends and this, their book, probably crossed the ocean at least twice, changed hands at least thrice, and is now ending its days in the ancient province of Agenais.

Correspondence

German Newspapers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial entitled "Keeping Out German Newspapers," in the issue of the *Nation* of June 8, is evidently based upon a misunderstanding, and I am certain you will wish to correct the following errors:

(1.) The Committee on Public Information, and for that matter Government departments, do not have the only files of German newspapers admitted to the country.

(2.) I am credibly informed that files of the leading German dailies are controlled by the Associated Press in New York city.

(3.) There are other collections of current newspapers from the Central Powers in the hands of private societies and associations.

(4.) The Library of Congress has files of German newspapers, periodicals, and statistical publications, which, so far as I am aware, are as accessible to students and to authorized representatives of the press as other publications in the Library.

(5.) The National Board for Historical Service, which is a volunteer organization of historians and economists, financially aided by the Carnegie Institution, has files of between thirty and forty leading German newspapers and periodicals, which can be consulted by writers and students doing serious work.

Naturally, representatives of the Government have priority right to consult these papers, but this by no means excludes their use by others.

The author of your editorial fails to distinguish between extracts from the German papers selected by the Government for republication for specific information purposes and material which is not so selected, but nevertheless is available for any writer or student who has the interest, intelligence, and command of the German language to use it.

The reasons for preventing the indiscriminate admission of German periodicals and newspapers are too obvious for comment. Such considerations look primarily towards military safety. Germany has imposed an embargo upon the export of technical and scientific publications likely to contain information of value to the allied countries. Adequate provision is now made for the access of American students and writers to all the sources of information concerning current German thought and sentiment which we possess, and these sources are being largely utilized.

VICTOR S. CLARK

New York, June 10

[We thank Mr. Clark for his correction. We would like, however, to ask him some questions:

(1.) What does he mean by saying that files of German dailies are "controlled" by the Associated Press?

(2.) Would Mr. Clark think it proper to name some of the "societies and associations" which are permitted to receive newspapers from the Central Powers, and to state on what grounds they have been accorded the privilege?

(3.) Does the Library of Congress allow German publications to be consulted freely by any persons outwardly respectable, or only by persons who can qualify as "students"

or "authorized representatives of the press"? If the latter, what are the qualifications necessary?

(4.) How comes it that the National Board for Historical Service, "a volunteer organization of historians and economists, financially aided by the Carnegie Institution," is allowed to receive "leading German newspapers and periodicals," to the number of thirty or forty?

(5.) We fail to understand Mr. Clark's final paragraph. If the export of certain publications "likely to contain information of value to the allied countries" is prohibited by Germany, what "obvious" considerations, looking "primarily towards military safety," dictate the exclusion from the United States of other German newspapers or periodicals which are not affected by the embargo, and which, presumably, contain no information which Germany is not willing to have known? And does Mr. Clark mean to imply that a reason which is "obvious" is therefore to be regarded as conclusive?—EDITOR.]

A Reconstructed Rebel

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your brief review of "A Woman's Wartime Journal" recalls this tale of a reconstructed rebel.

Another Southern woman, who also had the misfortune to be in Sherman's path as he marched to the sea, was thereby filled with abiding rancor which, having the gift of vituperation, she vented freely, more especially, having also the courage of her convictions, during her visits to her married niece in Boston. This, until the middle of the present decade; then, imperceptibly at first, a change took place—imperceptibly, because it seemed natural enough that von Kluck and Hindenburg should temporarily displace Sherman as the central figure in the good lady's private inferno; and not even her niece realized how complete was the displacement until one day her daughter came to her and whispered! "Mamma, mamma! Come downstairs and hear Aunt Jane praising Sherman!"

M. A. A.

Boston, June 3

Soldier Eloquence

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A recent advertisement of a great corporation has the following sentence: "Pershing at the tomb of America's old-time friend months ago reported, with true soldier eloquence, 'Lafayette, here we are.'" What Pershing reported with true soldier eloquence was, "Lafayette, we are here," and he knew, what the writer of the advertisement did not know, that "Lafayette, here we are," is not soldier or any other kind of eloquence. The latter is suggestive of the ordinary reporting for duty and is as commonplace as it is outworn. The transposition of the adverb originally for the sake of emphasis has lost all its force because of its frequent use in this connection. It has to return to its normal position in order to regain its lost strength. It is as if the American commander, realizing that Lafayette has been waiting all these years for the arrival of the sons of the democracy he had helped to establish, now tells the great Frenchman that his expectations have not been in vain. He is not the leader of a squad reporting for duty.

JAMES W. TUPPER

Lafayette College, June 2

An Argentine Novel*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your question in the *Nation* of May 11, "When shall we know as much about a Latin-American author?" brings to my mind José Mármol's "Amalia," a Spanish-American novel accessible in a Leipzig edition for over half a century. It was translated into German, Polish, and Russian many years ago, and there is also a French adaptation of it. Now I see from the advertising columns of a recent issue of the *Nation* that a school edition of this novel has appeared at last, so it may find readers in this country, too. It gives a vivid description of the terrible state of affairs which prevailed in Argentina during the tyranny of Rosas, and many a page of it has an actual interest for Americans even today. The people of Argentina rose in arms and suffered defeat. Daniel—the hero of the story—was deeply disappointed to hear the arguments by which the Argentine exiles in Montevideo tried to reason away the defeat—a thing a patriotic American invariably does in the case of a defeat of the Allies. The Russian translator was perfectly justified in giving the title "Friends are Worse than Enemies" to his version of the Spanish original. Also at the very end of the novel, where the author describes the sad end that befell most of the noble characters of the story and leaves his own question—what became of Rosas?—unanswered, the Russian translator supplied the reply: "Was there ever a villain that did not survive honest men?" Another Spanish-American novel, "María," a touching love story by Jorge Isaacs, has just been edited for school use and deserves careful study. It is also accessible in French and English.

JOSEPH DE PEROTT

Clark University, May 11

In the Interests of Liberty and Accuracy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apparently my first letter to the *Nation* (June 8) in re the La Follette quotation, must have been read on the Ides of March, or subsequently annotated with a misplaced recollection. It was not a St. Paul paper which furnished me with a correct report of a certain much-discussed sentence in the Senator's speech, but a Milwaukee lady, who deserves a decoration for her sense of justice and kindness in a day when patriotism—in some quarters—is conceived of as a brutal desire to lynch or verbally bastinado every one whose political opinions do not precisely conform to the war-whoop brand which we are supposed to disapprove in Germany. America is fast developing a kind of patriotism that will make the world safe neither for democracy nor for any kind of liberty. There is a good old book which speaks of a kind of zeal which eats one up. It is the same kind of zeal that lynches a man with the same unholy piety that inspired the slayers of Salem witches. The same good old book recounts the over-zealous piety of those disciples who rebuked somebody because he followed not with them.

By all means let us give our last atom of force to overthrow Teutonic despotism fostered by militarism. But why ignore despotism within our own borders? If we are fighting for liberty or death, why not fight for it wherever it is violated?

ELLEN BURNS SHERMAN

*A brief review of "Amalia" appeared in the *Nation* of May 18.

Ancient Camouflage

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the stress of the present war, with its emphasis upon new inventions, it is startling to discover how many of our modern devices were known to the Greeks and Romans. The commander of a transport who has the vessel darkened at night as a precaution against submarine attack is merely following the example of Himilco, the Carthaginian, who, as he set out by night for Sicily in the year 406 B. C., "put up lanterns screened in front, so that the enemy might not detect the expedition from the light." Eighteen years later, when Dionysius, the famous tyrant of Syracuse, was besieging Caulonia, on the southern coast of Italy, Aristides of Elea resorted to a more elaborate scheme. Aristides had set sail against Dionysius with twelve triremes, and Dionysius, hearing of this, had fitted out fifteen ships and sailed against him. "Aristides turned aside and avoided him, and as night came on gave orders to put up the lanterns. The ships of Dionysius followed their light. A little later the sailors took these down and lowered into the sea other lanterns fastened to huge pieces of cork. Then, turning away from the light, they sailed toward Caulonia, and arrived there before the ships of Dionysius, which were lured from their course by the gleam from the buoys."

Sails were often colored in ancient times, and the wooden part of the ship regularly received a coat of color in encaustic, sometimes applied evenly to the whole surface, sometimes put on in elaborate designs. We read of a clever ruse once employed by a certain Nikon, a helmsman of Samos. "Wishing to escape notice, while the enemy's triremes were lying at anchor near by, he colored his own ship with a paint similar to that of the enemy's. Then, taking on board those rowers who were bravest and strongest of body, he sailed right past the bows of the enemy's ships as if he were a friend of theirs. Proceeding toward the outermost of the vessels lying at anchor, he sailed past them, while the enemy were filled with amazement and wonder at his deed. And he was recognized as an enemy only when it was no longer possible for him to be captured."

The colors which the Elder Pliny lists as available for ships might well belong to a modern camoufleur: crimson, violet, blue, two shades of white, orange, and green. Pliny tells us how, when the fleet of Alexander the Great was sailing a certain river in India, the commanding officers vied with each other in painting the canvas different shades. Small wonder that "as the wind filled the many-colored sails, the banks of the river stood amazed."

Ordinarily, of course, these brilliant pigments were not applied with any idea of producing "low visibility" or "protective coloring." But a Greek writer of the third century A. D. describes a pirate ship as "painted a sea-blue color," and the Roman author of an "Epitome of the Art of War," dating between 383 and 450, states that "reconnoitring ships, in order that they may not be betrayed by their shining whiteness, have their sails and rigging dyed blue, like the waves of the sea; and the wax with which the ships are painted is stained this same color. The soldiers and sailors, too, put on blue clothing, so that on their reconnoitring expeditions they may escape detection, not only by night, but also by day." Could modern camouflage do any more?

CORNELIA C. COULTER

Poughkeepsie, N. Y., June 6

BOOKS

Revolution and Moderantism

The Russian Revolution. By Alexander Petrunkevitch, Samuel N. Harper, and Frank A. Golder; and *The Jugoslav Movement.* By Robert J. Kerner. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. \$1 net.

OF the three essays on the Russian revolution contained in this volume, one, by Frank Alfred Golder, deals with the events in Petrograd in March, 1917, which culminated in the overthrow of the Romanovs; another, by Samuel N. Harper, attempts to give an account of the relation between the various social groups and factions in the revolution up to the Bolshevik uprising in November; the third, by Alexander Petrunkevitch, is an explanation of the failure of all moderate and radical elements in Russia to stem the tide of Bolshevik influence and Bolshevik movement. Each essay contains valuable information and is born of a spirit of sympathy for Russia and of hope for her future.

Mr. Golder was an eye-witness of the March revolution. What he tells is impressive and full of the color of real life. He saw factories stopping work; the excitement spreading all over the city; crowds massing in the streets, red flags in hands; soldiers fraternizing with the revolutionary masses; regiments revolting against their officers; absolutism falling to pieces under the momentous onslaught of the people. Mr. Golder saw a great revolution in the making, and still he fails to realize that it was a real popular revolution. "What struck me most of all," he writes, "was the kind of men and women who made this world event. I watched them during the week, and they seemed to be in great part boys and girls, hoodlums, students, poorly dressed men and women, without organization, plans, or leaders." Of course, no other kind of men and women could have been expected to march into the streets and start riots in the face of a hostile police and an uncertain army: aged bankers and gentlemen in evening clothes do not make revolutions. Yet, somehow, Mr. Golder finds no word of appreciation for those "poorly dressed men and women." And it is only natural that he looks upon the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies that sprang up from among those "poorly dressed men and women" as upon an intruder who attempted to interfere with the "real" government. As to the revolutionary leaders, who for twenty years prior to 1917 were conducting revolutionary propaganda among the masses, paying with years of imprisonment and exile for months of political activity, Mr. Golder has to tell about them only that they rushed "from Switzerland, the United States, France, and other parts of the world, to make speeches and to divide the spoils." They seem to him to be more unwelcome intruders than even the Councils of Workmen and Soldiers. He does not realize that those revolutionaries had as much right to influence the destinies of their people as the gentlemen who had stayed at home.

Mr. Harper sees clearly the growth of the Soviet influence. He realizes that "the Councils of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies acted on the principle of a direct mandate from the whole people." He knows that "the councils, the land committees, and the other organizations that had come into existence with and in the course of the revolution were almost exclusively Socialist in their political affiliations."

The logical conclusion would be that there is something elemental in this vast movement, something uncontrollable, for which nobody is to be blamed whatever the results may be. Such, in fact, is the history of the Soviets—a history of masses who, for the first time in centuries, suddenly realized that they were masters of their destinies and who, in blind groping for a new life, frequently destroyed things and institutions that might have been of great value for the very aims for which they were striving. Whatever the outcome of the revolution, it is evident that this big movement has to be treated not as a malicious plot of a number of “bad men” and not as something contemptible in substance, but as the history of numberless millions, in a country shaken to its foundations, trying to find a new path towards new social and political justice. Looked upon from this angle, the events hardly warrant Mr. Harper’s statement that the Kornilov affair “was an effort on the part of the constructive groups, including the moderate Socialists, to . . . establish a stronger Government . . . representing a national movement to organize all the vital forces of the country.” The fact is that no group of Socialists ever participated in Kornilov’s attempt at counter-revolution, and that a great effort of sociological imagination is required to class all the millions of workingmen, peasants, and soldiers represented in the Soviets as not being “vital forces of the country.” What lies behind such assertions is a lack of realization of the *vastness* and the *profoundness* of the Russian revolutionary struggles.

Closely related with this attitude is a condemnation of “party ties and party programmes” in the Russian revolution. It is impossible to gain any adequate idea of the revolution if we eliminate the clash of opposing social forces as expressed in varying “party ties and party programmes.” In fact, this is the Russian revolution. Mr. Petrunkevitch, in his essay, seems to touch upon this salient truth. He explains why the Constitutional Democratic party lost its influence (“their ideology is still based on the long outworn idealistic capitalism, and for this reason alone does not and cannot appeal to non-owning classes”); he realizes the causes of the waning influence of the Socialist-Revolutionists (“they tried to mediate between Social-Democrats and Constitutional-Democrats and naturally failed in this attempt”). A conclusion presents itself almost irresistibly to the effect that the masses represented in the Soviets made a *conscious choice* between various parties and programmes, selecting the one that suited them best. This would indicate that the Bolsheviks were not the leaders of the masses, but were rather their tool and their mouthpiece. Yet Mr. Petrunkevitch does not hesitate to state that “Trotzky’s assertion that the Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Government is a government of workingmen, soldiers, and peasants is nothing but a perversion of fact”; and he seems still to hold to the idea that the Soviet Government is a conspiracy of a number of intellectual plotters. Of Mr. Petrunkevitch, who is himself a Russian and whose father is a leader of the Constitutional Democratic party, one might expect a more adequate explanation of historic events in his country. He even accuses the Soviet leaders for using “assumed names”; but an “assumed name” is nothing disreputable in Russia.

The essay on the Jugo-Slav movement by Robert J. Kerner, forming the fourth chapter of the volume, contains illuminating information on the growth of national sentiment among the Jugo-Slavs in spite of political, economic, social, and geographical divisions.

Spenser as a Prophet

Edmund Spenser: A Critical Study. By Herbert Ellsworth Cory. Berkeley: University of California Press. \$3.50.

SPENSER is coming into something like his just share of scholarly attention. The subject during the last dozen or fifteen years of an increasing number of important monographs, he at last achieves the distinction of a book all to himself, a large one and, it may be said at once, a good one. Professor Cory has not only read Spenser’s poetry sensitively and long; he has besides an extensive acquaintance with Spenser criticism, a part of the subject on which he has already published much that is substantially included in the present volume. Twenty years from now or less, one ventures to think, Professor Cory will write a still better book, if he is not spoiled by too much praise for the good one he has just written. What in the present book is often a charming ardency is a little too often the cocksureness to which only youth is supposed to presume. This appears in a tendency to refer just a little grandly to “general biological evolution, palæontology, ethnology, heredity, general psychology, comparative psychology, psychopathology, economics, history, the empirical study of ethical values, and the empirical study of æsthetic values”; to talk a little solemnly about himself and his critical method; and to lecture quite magisterially on internationalism, feminism, Socialism, and romantic love. We are confident that Professor Cory, when he comes to write the better book, will not regret having written as he has done here, though he may be inclined—we hope he will—to smile a little. He will also, we think, be more solicitous to present the ideas current in Spenser’s day and his relation to them, and less concerned, though happily not out of touch with them, to bring in all the latest outgivings of what in the future may happen to be the sciences and philosophies fashionable among those who are quite sure that they think. The intellectual background of Spenser’s period is something which at present he is quite willing to leave to the professors of literature, for whom he expresses all the fine disdain of a graduate student in his first year.

These scornful glances aside of his are not directed, however, against contemporary Spenserians; on them, almost without exception young American scholars, he bestows liberal praise and makes full and discriminating use of their results. Although he emphasizes the moral earnestness of the poet, he does not himself offer much in the way of new detail. His distinction lies rather in the sweep of his interpretation of the “Faërie Queene” as an allegory prophetic of the ideal imperial England that was to be, in his setting forth of Spenser’s fine youthful courage in lifting his voice against those in power who did not share his vision, and his gradual disillusionment as the heroes at whose hands he looked to find the realization of his dreams, Sidney, Leicester, Essex, drop one by one away, leaving the Blatant Beast abroad in the land. Like praise may also be bestowed on the long vista which Professor Cory opens in his concluding chapter on Spenser’s literary fortunes. There are many illuminating bits of criticism scattered through the book, such as the excellent comparison which he draws between Spenser and Drayton, and his recurring illustration of Spenser’s “Parthian manner.” There are rather too many words obviously misprinted. The absence of an index is regrettable.

A New Novelist

Where Bonds Are Loosed. By E. L. Grant Watson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

The Mainland. By E. L. Grant Watson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

THESE two novels, connected in story and published very nearly together, may be taken as the first utterance of a new novelist of promise. He is an Englishman, a Cantabrigian who, less than ten years ago, won a "first" in natural science and began life as zoölogist in an ethnological expedition to northwest Australia. After about a year and a half in the "bush," he returned to England by way of the Fiji Islands, where he spent some time among the natives. The experience had been successful from the scientific point of view, but it is plain that the adventurer's new views of human nature and human life were more absorbing to him than his technical observations. He dropped science as a profession and set out to be a story-teller. But he does not wish to be an entertainer. These two books are pretty directly the fruits of his journeyings to westward. He returned not only with a mind full of scenes and data, but with a very strong impression of the crude virtues of frontier life, of its function, above all, as a test of the real character hampered by the bonds of civilized convention. "Life can survive all bludgeoning provided that the individual soul is so violently shaken that all its old valuations fall *completely* away. Out of the ruins, life naked and without shame, but beautiful in that naked vitality, can rise to new expression." Such is the theme of his first story. On two small islands, a difficult sea-passage from Sydney, he places two hospitals for the treatment of native diseases, each sex to its island. The two institutions are under the care of the same physician, but the smaller island, the men's, is left for the most part to the hands of a slipshod assistant—until big Sherwin the Englishman is sent there to look out for the cattle that belong to the establishment. Sherwin is a rough brute, but he has the essentials of manhood; and the story shows him steadily emerging from his position as a nominal inferior, and making his own destiny. This involves the destiny of a woman, Nurse Desmond, who has come to the woman's hospital as matron. She has, like Sherwin, a primitive and forthright nature, and is strongly sexed. A young doctor becomes her lover, but he is essentially a weakling. In the astonishing finale, he is to be slain by Sherwin, to whom, as her fitting mate, Nurse Desmond promptly and permanently yields herself. Where we part with romantic convention is in the calm resumption of life by the "guilty pair," and our realization that they are going to be happy together. It is true that the killing has happened on Sherwin's remote island, and is unlikely to be brought home; but by all the rules he should live under the shadow of his crime, and learn to hate the woman for whom he has sinned. It is not so. At the beginning of "The Mainland," some seventeen years later, we find that the pair have lived all that time contentedly on their island, happy in their freedom from the restraints and corruptions of "the mainland."

Their son, John Sherwin, has also been content with his parents and with the island life. Now and then a steamer touches there, with whose friendly captain Sherwin barter his island products for necessities. At sixteen the boy has never left his parents; but now the urge of youth begins.

The father is reluctant to have his son leave the shelter and health of their secluded way for the filthiness of towns. But the time comes when the boy is bound to go. His way is to lie among men, and our story is of his finding it. It takes him upon a sea journey with an amateur yachting ethnologist among dangerous tribes of islanders; upon a land journey into the bush with a queer naturalist-prospecter; upon a trail of gold which brings him, still young, to a competency and freedom to choose his own place and manner of living.

The action of this second narrative of Mr. Watson's is far wider and more generous in all ways than that of the first. Until the very end, when violence clears the air, there was something sultry and oppressive about the whole atmosphere of that strange tale. We may not have been sure that the ending itself was really free from hidden morbidity. About the present narrative we have no such feeling of doubt. Since it is a story of youth, sex naturally plays its important part. John Sherwin has his experiences such as present themselves to lads of his comeliness and lustiness. They begin with a sentimental boyish passion for the fair, neglected wife of the yachting ethnologist. There is a dreamed-of elopement, prosaically broken by chance; in the reaction the youth loses himself in a brief nightmare of debauchery. Thereafter he walks cleanly, if not always upon the established paths. The note is "modern" enough in all conscience, but at least it is frank without prurience. In Hilda Vance, particularly, is a portrait which experience if not social decorum may accept as embodying an increasingly familiar type. Self-reliant, physically fit, a trifle hard, she defies a "double standard" of sexual morality, before or after marriage. "Men aren't always fussing about what is going to happen to them next year," she declares. "If women want freedom, they must be thorough." Her temporary connection with John Sherwin is not even an arrangement, and when it has run its natural course and ceased to hold a place in the foreground for either of them, she terminates it as cheerfully and unsentimentally as he. Less wholesome is the sentimental intrigue with the female Mrs. Harper that follows, an entanglement from which only flight can free the wearied male. Meanwhile he has been under no illusion as to the need of finding a real mate; and when the time comes he finds her in the person of a girl who is by no means a fool because her conscious destiny lies in wifehood and motherhood. Sherwin's first impulse (like his father's in his own instance) is to shield her altogether from the ugliness of the world. He does not wish her to leave the beautiful country of her birth, which is to be their own dwelling-place, for even temporary experience of city life. For out of his apprenticeship has come something very like his father's contempt and distrust for herded men. He hates "the misery of the streets; the poverty, greed, dishonesty, luxury, indifference." But his mate's simplicity is not that of the harem: "I want to know about things for myself," she says. "I'm not so weak as to break at the first touch." She has her way; and we part with the newly mated pair at the moment of their setting forth upon the whole adventure. . . . What we have not conveyed and cannot convey at second-hand is the really important quality of these books, the fresh and genuine savor which a reviewer is always thirsting for above all things. The war has commandeered the hand of this writer also, among so many; we may look to see him among its forcible interpreters.

A Self-Made Soldier

The Life of Lieutenant-General Chaffee. By William Harding Carter, Major-General, U. S. Army. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. \$2.50 net.

IN all the recent military history of our country, no officer of high rank has better exemplified the American idea of democracy than Adna Romanza Chaffee. Of New England ancestry, but born on a farm in the Western Reserve of Ohio and obtaining the rudiments of an education in a country school, his ambition to be a soldier found its sole satisfaction in the drill given by an old sergeant to him and his fellow-members of a Wide-Awake association in the Lincoln campaign of 1860. To the call for troops, the following spring, to defend the Union, he was among the first in his neighborhood to respond. On his way to enlist in the Twenty-third Ohio Volunteers, his eye was caught by a poster inviting enlistments in the newly organized Sixth Cavalry of the regular army. Its picture of a mounted soldier, reinforced by the eloquence of the trooper in charge, proved so tempting to a lad who had passed most of his nineteen years in close contact with horses that he changed his mind and signed the roll of the Sixth, in Company K, then commanded by Captain Charles Russell Lowell, a nephew of the famous James. From Captain Lowell, for whom he acquired an almost romantic admiration, young Chaffee learned the art of keeping in the kindest personal touch with his men, by showing consideration for their minor faults and failures without relaxing a wholesome discipline. It may be noted in passing that two of Adna's brothers, Truman and Sherburn, joined the Union army at the outbreak of the war, while another—Orestes, the eldest of the group—having removed from Ohio to Alabama some years before, entered the Confederate service, but survived the war long enough to take a clerical position in the War Department at Washington.

In less than three months Adna had won promotion to a sergeancy, and by the spring of 1863 had become a lieutenant. It was not till two years after the close of the war that he was commissioned captain, though in the meantime he had sought to exchange military for civil life and embark in business, but been dissuaded by his superiors, who could not bear to lose so excellent an officer. For some thirty years thereafter he was engaged chiefly in operations in Texas, western Kansas, Indian Territory, Arizona, and New Mexico, dealing by turns with Indians, outlaw bands, and trouble-makers on the Mexican border. His frontier experience increased his hold upon his men, which can be easily understood through such typical incidents as his abstention from water during a march through a very arid country, so that his scouts, who had to be on foot a great deal while he was riding, should not suffer from thirst; and the violent antipathy which he suddenly developed for bacon when the supply fell short and one of his subordinates seemed to need all that could be got, and which mysteriously ceased as soon as the normal ration was restored.

Towards the end of his frontier work Chaffee was made major of the Ninth Cavalry, and a few years later lieutenant-colonel of the Third. The outbreak of the war with Spain gave him still another lift, largely due to the suggestion of his present biographer, who was then an assistant to the Adjutant-General; and in May, 1898, though not yet in the conventional order of promotion, he was appointed a brigadier-general of volunteers.

While at Tampa he jotted down a number of observations indicating that the military judgment of the Government was as confused as it occasionally appears to be now; towards the close of the war, on the eve of the "round-robin" incident at Santiago, when the army was badly smitten with a disease much more menacing than the bullets of the enemy had proved, he expressed his gratitude to God for the Spanish surrender, but added:

At Tampa we saw the complete breaking down of the Quartermaster and Commissary Departments, but all seemed to think the Medical Department would be efficient and adequate. Horrible disappointment—no one will ever know how great unless some one shall have the nerve to write a true history of this campaign.

He could hardly forgive the war authorities for delaying the withdrawal of the army so long after the surrender instead of sending it out of the malarial fever zone at once, though transport after transport was sailing with scarcely a soul on board besides the crew. Among his other Cuban notes occurs this striking estimate of the Military Governor, Leonard Wood, whose chief of staff he had been for a time:

Gen. Wood needs about him very steady and cautious men—men who are not his tools—sycophants; but he does not want such material. It is necessary, to serve him as he wishes, that his assistants think as he does, and believe in his infallibility. He is himself a quick thinker, a hard worker, but this does not necessarily imply that he is a correct thinker always. He is further impressed with the idea that he has a mission—is charged with a great reformation.

On quitting Cuba, General Chaffee was ordered to China, to take charge of the American contingent in the allied expedition for the relief of the legations threatened by the Boxer rebellion of 1900. Throughout this movement, the description of which fills a larger space in General Carter's book than any other single feature, Chaffee displayed the same anxiety that he had shown in Cuba to clear the ground as soon as the crisis was passed. Though rather reluctantly consenting to the insistence of the foreign commanders associated with him that the allied troops should remain for the winter, he would not yield to the desire of most of them to turn over the supreme command of all the forces to the German general, Count Waldersee; and he joined the Japanese commander in standing out against the wish of their European colleagues to invade the Forbidden City, for he read into the proposal a purpose to despoil the helpless Chinese. Throughout his stay he laid stress upon the fact that the expedition had been organized to rescue the legations, not to avenge upon the Chinese Government the misdeeds of a reckless body of insurgents. Indeed, he carried his notion of helping rather than hurting China to such a point that when two Sikh soldiers fired upon an American patrol who had interfered with their looting operations, he justified the patrol in killing the looters; and a party of Chinese robbers who attacked an old man and his daughter were captured by an American guard, court-martialled, convicted, and promptly beheaded.

Such stern measures, emphasizing the policy of an American chieftain noted for his generally benevolent disposition, exerted a powerful influence in keeping down disorder. Even when Waldersee, acting in the most methodical manner, set a body of his troops to dismantling, for removal to Germany as trophies, some ancient bronze astronomical instruments discovered in a Chinese observatory, Chaffee could not forbear addressing to the Count a letter of protest, saying:

I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that my Government would vehemently denounce any officer of its service who might enter upon spoliation of this sort, and it will sincerely regret to learn that any nation with which it coöperated to relieve the besieged legations in Peking authorizes or permits its troops to injure or remove any instruments or other part of the observatory.

The news of what he had done drew forth two characteristic comments in Washington. Theodore Roosevelt, who had just come into the Vice-Presidency, sent him an enthusiastic note, declaring the whole American people "your debtors for what you have done in China—for everything, from the way you fought to the way you have done justice, . . . including your letter to Waldersee." But from the Adjutant-General came a cablegram regarding the Waldersee incident: "The President regrets the severity of the language which appears to have been used."

The most notable feature of Chaffee's next assignment, which was to the command of the military end of the American Government of the Philippines, was his contest with the civil authority represented by Governor Taft and the Commission. The most conspicuous issue was as to whether persons accused of crime were subject to the jurisdiction of civil courts or courts-martial. A case which attracted especial attention was that of an infantry private who, while on sentry duty in a military reservation, killed a Filipino. He was tried by court-martial and acquitted of wrongdoing. Thereupon the civil court of first instance insisted upon its right to try him again for the same act and sentenced him to prison for twelve years and a day. The officers and soldiers raised by voluntary contribution a fund to meet the expenses of appeal—amounting to between ten and fifteen thousand dollars—and carried the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, which decided in favor of the military tribunal and thus restored the prisoner to freedom. It must be said to Chaffee's credit that although such collisions of authority were inevitable, he managed his end of them with a degree of tact that left no hard feeling even on the part of Governor Taft.

The book is written in a military rather than a literary style, and occasionally, in the interest of completeness, devotes pages to the formalities of official correspondence which might better have been trimmed into a dozen lines of indirect narrative; but it gives us, as a whole, a very acceptable portrait of an American universally respected as a self-made soldier, who rose to be Chief of the General Staff on merit alone and not as a uniformed beneficiary of politics. Such a book is bound to be not only interesting, but informing.

Contributors to this Issue

THOMAS REED POWELL is associate professor of constitutional law in Columbia University.

CENSOR PEREGRINUS is a well-known writer for the *Nation*, intimately conversant with conditions in the University of Nebraska and throughout the State.

THEODORE STANTON, an old and valued *Nation* contributor, long resident in France, has for many years made a special study of the life and writings of George Ripley.

Notes

IN the near future the Woman's Press will publish: "Things that Cannot Be Shaken," by Charlotte H. Adams, and "The Young Woman Citizen," by Mary Austin.

"The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse," translated by Vicente Blasco Ibáñez, will be published shortly by E. P. Dutton & Company.

Henry Holt & Company announce for publication early in September "The United States Naval Reserves," by Frank H. Potter.

Among the July publications of Frederick A. Stokes Company are: "Kitty Carstairs," by J. J. Bell; "The Oilskin Packet," by Reginald Berkeley and James Dixon; "From All the Fronts," by Donald A. Mackenzie; "The Constitutional and Parliamentary History of Ireland," by J. G. Swift McNeil; "Modern Art," by Charles Marriott; "Mary Elizabeth's War Time Recipes"; "Ardours and Endurances," American edition, by Robert Nichols; "Army and Navy Uniforms and Insignia," new and enlarged edition, by Col. Dion Williams.

The forthcoming publications of the Macmillan Company are as follows: "Barbara Picks a Husband," by Hermann Hagedorn; "A Traveler in War Time," by Winston Churchill; "Home and Farm Food Preservation," by William V. Cruess; "A Manual of Local Defence," by Henry A. Bellows; "An Appeal to Conscience," by Kelly Miller.

A BRIEF retrospect of the great world ideals which have marked the progress of education from the time of the Jews is given in "Permanent Values in Education," by Kenneth Richmond (Dutton; \$1.25 net), with emphasis upon such large figures as Comenius, Locke, Rousseau and his disciples, who are linked more or less closely to such modern educators as James, Dewey, Hall, and Thorndike. These men have all been in revolt against the education of their time, but broad enough to recognize the good in it and to build upon it. The idea of status, the fact of education's giving a sense of superiority, has always been a handicap to real progress. Even Christianity has not been free from it; and it is clearly seen in the prevailing idea of the past century that Latin and Greek was the education for a gentleman. The author believes that to-day there is too much effort towards educating one out of his class, instead of trying to improve the whole class to which he belongs. "There must always be peasants; let us educate them to be as good peasants as possible." Some other permanent values mentioned are the union of the scientific and literary training in education, with a revaluation of both; and the breaking down of partitions between subjects of study which ought to be correlated. The author quotes Mr. Chesterton in saying that the old ideals have not been tried and found wanting, but that they have been tried and found too difficult of attainment.

WELCOME to lovers of Stevenson will be Mrs. Luther S. Livingston's revision of Colonel Prideaux's "Bibliography of the Works of Robert Louis Stevenson" (London: Frank Hollings). The effort, of course, has been to make the record complete to the time of publication. Even under the head of "First Editions and Separate Works" over a score of new titles are added. Some of these are very interesting indeed. Two editions of "John Nichol-

son" earlier than the accepted "American Series, No. 60," are listed. Why the facsimile title-page of the latter is retained in spite of its loss of priority is not explained. Other discoveries are the copyright editions of "The Beach of Falesà" and "The Beach of Falesà and the Bottle Imp," as well as a copyright edition of "The Weir of Hermiston" in three parts. Most interesting of all is the first American edition of "Macaire," which has been long sought by American collectors. Though the preface is dated 1917, several interesting publications of the preceding year are not listed: a handsome little edition of "Father Damien" in 1916 and Stephen Chalmers's mellow recollection called "The Penny Piper of Saranac." Professor Rice's "Robert Louis Stevenson: How to Know Him" should have been included for the sake of completeness. In format the present edition is identical with the first. The index, unfortunately, does not list all the pages on which may be found the headings that are included. But in the main the revision has been conducted with meticulous care. The new edition will be prized by every Stevenson circle.

TWO thin books of pictures connected with the war have come to us: Volume I of Louis Raemaekers's "Cartoon History of the War" (Century; \$1.50) and Joseph Pennell's "Pictures of War Work in America" (Lippincott; \$1.50 net). As has often been the case in the history of caricature, the tremendous effectiveness of Raemaekers's cartoons is not due to any great technical merit of draughtsmanship. We have far better draughtsmen than he on our daily press, but they have not his effectiveness because they have not his fecundity of thought or his clarity of presentation. The cartoon is really a form of literature and its greatest virtues are the literary virtues of having something worth saying to say, and of saying it with the utmost force and clearness. It might be better for our art, in general, if it had not drifted so far away from these literary virtues, and our painters would certainly know better how to express their patriotic emotions at this time if they had not systematically trained themselves to a contempt for the expression of ideas. That they are as patriotic as any other class of citizens they have shown in many ways, but it is only the illustrators and a few of the mural painters who have been able to give any definite artistic expression to their patriotism because their art was better suited to such expression. Even in the stress of war an artist cannot easily remake his temperament or reverse his training. He is more likely to find himself impotent to go on with his old work than to be able to express his new feelings.

M. R. PENNELL has been luckier than some others in finding the way to relate his work to the overwhelming interest of the moment. His talent is wholly picturesque, and he, who as a critic relegated all Rembrandt's imaginative etchings to the category of "pot-boilers," has made no effort to express anything beyond the look of things. But for many years he has been "trying to record the Wonder of Work," as he says in his introduction, "and work never was as wonderful as it is to-day." So, by expressing the look of munition factories and shipyards, and without "any idea of helping to win the war," he finds himself saying something interesting to those who are trying to help win the war as well as to those who are interested in the clever representation of picturesque effects.

IF there can be superfluous books on Lincoln, "The Voice of Lincoln" (Scribner; \$2.50), by Judge R. M. Wanamaker, of the Supreme Court of Ohio, is one of them, or very near it. The plan promises well: to find out the secret of Lincoln's greatness, and to reveal it, wherever possible, through his own words. But the execution leaves almost everything to be desired. Imperfectly digested, put together without adroitness, verbose and repetitious in the commentary, the work disappoints when it does not irritate. It adds no new facts; it offers no fresh interpretations. The single touch of novelty appears in the analysis of the Gettysburg Address, which Judge Wanamaker has shown to contain the word *dedicate* in every one of its ten sentences—but four. The *this* of the fifth sentence and the *consecrated* of the seventh furnish two equivalents; while for the remaining two, says Judge Wanamaker, "the third sentence [has] the word 'battlefield,' and . . . the eighth sentence . . . the words 'what they did here,' the simplest, strongest, and most picturesque language possible to express the active idea of dedication" [!] Though so naïve, the book is candid, and as accurate as Herndon, upon whom it leans heavily, with help from Hill and Rothschild. Readers unacquainted with Lincoln literature and inattentive to the art of biography need not complain of the book. Others will probably wish that some defter hand might give us a *Lincoln peint par lui-même*.

MUCH light is thrown upon the history of Portugal during the fourteenth century and the two following centuries by Mr. Aubrey F. G. Bell, an authority on the literature of the country, in "Portuguese Portraits" (Longmans, Green). They are brief sketches, with many personal anecdotes, of the lives of seven men, who, by their "deeds of high emprise" during that period, made their country the foremost sea Power and added to its domain extensive possessions in Asia and Africa. King Dinis is the first, through whose wise and firm rule the kingdom became independent, who founded the national university, and was one of the greatest of Portugal's early poets. Among the others are Prince Henry the Navigator and Vasco da Gama, noted for their passion for the exploration of the unknown part of Africa and the East. Castro is the last, who in 1538 sailed to India as captain of a ship and ten years later, after successful conflicts with the Moors, died, Viceroy of India, "in the arms of his friend St. Francis Xavier."

A BEAUTIFUL piece of book-making, but a mere compilation, is "Historic Mackinac" (Macmillan; \$12.50 net), in two volumes, by Edwin O. Wood. One of the volumes is principally historical; the other, principally descriptive. To make up the former, the author has pieced together, with some care and scholarship, passages bearing upon the varied history of the island from a hundred sources—from historians like Parkman, Thwaites, and Winsor, from writers upon narrower historical themes like Hinsdale, Cooley, and Quaife, from the Wisconsin and Michigan Historical Collections, from original sources like the Jesuit Relations and Canadian Archives, from Irving and Jonathan Carver and a score of monographs. He has contributed introductory matter and a slight matrix of transitional narrative, but nothing else. The long stretches of quotation are wearisome, especially as there is no little repetition. The second volume is composed chiefly of the writings of distinguished visitors to Mackinac. Henry

Schoolcraft lived there for a number of years, keeping an interesting diary; Miss Martineau gave a good account of its beauty in 1836; gruff Captain Marryat was unimpressed by it; Mrs. Jameson was enthusiastic. Constance Fenimore Woolson became dithyrambic over it and would have given it the absurd name "Fairy Island"; and Bryant hoped that it would not be "improved" like other watering-places. Sketches by less notable persons are included, photographs are numerous and beautiful, and there are good maps, a full bibliography, and an account of the plant life. But librarians will blanch to think of the result if the *cacoethes compilandii* spreads.

ROTHAMSTED is a name known in every part of the world where agriculture is anything more than a matter of tradition and custom. For eighty years it has been the scene of continuous scientific experimentation in agricultural chemistry. When, in 1834, John Bennett Lawes, at the age of twenty, entered on the personal management of his home farm of about two hundred and fifty acres at Rothamsted, his interest in the composition of drugs led him to fit up a complete laboratory for chemical research in this direction. These studies led him, very naturally, to an interest in the relations between chemistry and agriculture, and in 1837 he began experiments on the effects of different manures. He soon discovered that spent animal charcoal was much increased in efficacy as a fertilizer if it was first treated with sulphuric acid, and extended this treatment to apatite and other mineral phosphates with equally good results. The new "superphosphate of lime," as the product was called, was employed on a large scale on the Rothamsted farm in 1840 and 1841 with such success that in 1842 Lawes took out a patent on the process and became a chemical manufacturer. He employed his profits in the creation and maintenance of a large experiment station at Rothamsted, where, with Dr. J. H. Gilbert, a young chemist who had studied under Liebig, a large variety of agricultural problems were investigated in the following fifty-seven years. In the early years of this work Lawes conceived the idea of perpetuating the investigations, and in 1889 covenanted to pay to trustees £100,000 for this purpose, leasing the laboratory and experimental fields to the same trustees for ninety-nine years at a peppercorn rent. The conduct of the experiments later came into the hands of A. D. Hall, now secretary of the Board of Agriculture, who in 1905 published the first summary of the work at Rothamsted in "The Book of the Rothamsted Experiments," that now appears in a second edition brought to date by Dr. E. J. Russell, the present director (Dutton; \$4 net). In the new edition two chapters have been added: one on the secondary effects of manures on the soil; the other, a summary of the investigations made during the past ten years on the biochemical processes in the soil.

A TIMELY book is Charles H. Hughes's "Handbook of Ship Calculations, Construction, and Operation" (Appleton). It is a veritable encyclopædia of information of value to owners and officers of ships, ship and engine draughtsmen, marine engineers, and all others engaged in the constructing and operating of ships. From his "Machine Shop Practice" (Appleton) Mr. W. B. Hartman has excluded all but the very simple mathematics so as to make the discussion intelligible to a person desiring to learn how to use machines.

Drama

Little Plays and Little Theatres

THE one-act play has until recent years been the step-child of the American theatre. In a country where the short-story has flourished as perhaps the most characteristic form of expression of the direct, naïve, humorous, hurrying American spirit, the corresponding dramatic form has languished while it thrived in England and France. But when the era of little theatres began a few years ago, the little play, too, became a permanent accession to our dramatic life. The late lamented Princess Theatre, inaugurated as a theatre of thrills in imitation of the Grand Guignol at Paris, first taught a sophisticated public the pleasure that may be found in passing from horrors that harrow the emotions to *jeux d'esprit* that stimulate the intellect. The one-acter passed from its debased existence as a vaudeville "number" into its higher life as an art-form, recognized and practiced by a handful of American writers.

During the past season the Provincetown Players, the Washington Square Players, and the Greenwich Village Theatre have devoted the greater part of their season to the one-act play, so that a whole school of young American playwrights, actors, scenic designers, and directors now renders it tribute. Of these the Provincetown Players offer an interesting example of what the amateur workshop may accomplish. This organization of writers and artists who work at their profession in New York in winter and in Provincetown on Cape Cod in summer began writing, acting, and producing their own plays "for the fun of the thing" two years ago. In their bare, uncomfortable, ill-ventilated hall, with costumes and stage settings made by themselves, this little company has mitigated the blank dreariness of many mediocre plays, badly acted, by producing now and again a play with a flash of the Promethean fire. Mr. Eugene O'Neill and Miss Susan Glaspell are two products of whom they and this country may well be proud.

The Washington Square Players, the oldest, most successful, and most accomplished group devoted to the one-act play, long ago passed from the amateur stage to the professional. Even during the last two years, when their removal to the Comedy Theatre brought them into direct competition with the commercial theatre, they have not swerved from their devotion, and it is due to them more than to any other single element that the one-act play and its playwrights became established in American drama. Although in earlier seasons they brought to our knowledge the dramatic work of Maeterlinck, Chekhov, Schnitzler, Roberto Bracco, and others, during the past season they have devoted themselves increasingly to American plays. They have brought before a larger public the two young American writers just mentioned and others who might otherwise have—one must not say "blushed unseen," for the young writers of this group never blush nor could they remain unseen in the fierce white limelight that beats on New York's artistic circles—but who might have failed to attract the attention of "regular" managers and the interest of a public outside their own group. Mr. O'Neill, son of that veteran actor, James O'Neill, whom our fathers all knew as "Monte Cristo," has turned for his dramatic material to the life of the sea that he followed after he ran away from Princeton, and in two seasons has established himself as a one-act playwright. "Bound

East from Cardiff," "In the Zone," "The Rope," and "He," have the sea in the background and sailors as their heroes. With a sense of character as remarkable as his power of vivid characterization, this young American makes his rough toilers of the sea live. "In the Zone," avoiding the pitfalls of the cheap war play in spite of its submarine, bomb, and spy plot, is a little masterpiece of realism and suspense. "The Rope," with its hideously unrelieved picture of a New England family of degenerates, is as powerful as it is ugly. Miss Susan Glaspell's talent follows a different vein of comedy and social satire. In "Trifles" last season, her best work, she presented a searching and moving study of a group of Middle Western farmers' wives in the grip of home-ly tragedy, but "Suppressed Desires" and "Close the Book!" deal with extremely modern, sophisticated characters and situations. The former directs its witty satire at the psycho-analytic, Freudian theory put into practice, while the latter aims its shafts at the self-conscious defiers of social order no less than at the worshippers of cultured "college" conservatism.

In their work of fostering the one-acter, these Players have developed actors and designers as well. Mr. Roland Young, Mr. Arthur Hohl, Mr. José Rubén, and others have won leading positions with the regular managers, while the chief scenic designers of the Washington Square Company, among them Mr. Rollo Peters, have trained New York to an appreciation and an understanding of the modern ideas of scenery and costume current on the Continent. When M. Jacques Copeau brought over the Vieux Colombier Company he found that he was not an innovator in a field where Young America had progressed as far as Young France.

The Greenwich Village Theatre, an offspring of the older company, directed by Mr. Frank Conroy, one of its products, has followed in its footsteps. This semi-professional association of young enthusiasts for the art of the theatre, wearying of the banal and trite offerings of the "legitimate" stage, has devoted its chief energies to one-act plays by Arthur Schnitzler, Eugene O'Neil, Miss Glaspell, and Harold Brighouse. The bills that were presented ran the gamut from mediæval mysteries to that modern Scandinavian drama, "Karen," by Hjalmar Bergstrom, noted in these pages before. Mr. Conroy's interests, like those of the educated European producer, are various, so that at Christmas he presented three of the Chester cycle of mysteries, in the spring a pastoral play suitable to the season, at another time a fantasy of poetic beauty, again a grim satire on war.

A new association known as the Actors' and Authors' Theatre, organized to produce plays on the coöperative plan and thus eliminate the commercial theatrical manager, has just sprung into being and produced two bills at the Fulton Theatre, one of these consisting of one-act plays. None of them displayed sufficient vitality or distinction to merit discussion here, although the acting of Mr. Whitford Kane, who has also lent his rare talent to productions by the Washington Square Players, Miss Minnie Dupree, and Miss Edith Taliaferro was of excellent quality.

Although the little theatres may not now weather the trials of the war, serious financial conditions, transportation difficulties, and public indifference, in troubled times, to the eternal values of art, in New York at least they have won a definite place for themselves. *Multum in parvo* has made its appeal in the theatre to a public that will not wholly dwindle, and the one-act play, like the little theatre, has come to stay on the American stage.

M. C. D.

Finance

The Harvest Outlook

IT is not a new experience for the United States to be driven by force of various circumstances into a trying and sometimes critical economic situation, only to find that situation altered with the greatest suddenness and with absolute completeness by a harvest of unprecedented magnitude, coming at a moment of the consuming world's largest need. In the character of the unfavorable influences which had been at work during the six or eight months before this spring season, there is perhaps no close resemblance to those which had prevailed before the great harvests of 1879 and 1898 and 1914. Nevertheless, the war uncertainties, the derangement of our foreign commerce, and the midwinter interruption of our industrial activities, along with the difficult financial conditions created by the new loans and taxes at home and by the disturbed international markets, had in some degree produced the same effects.

On each of those earlier occasions, an American grain crop of wholly unexpected size had a hand in changing the whole position of things. Recollection of the part played by fortunate harvests in achieving specie resumption, in rescuing the country from the silver free-coinage peril, and in pulling our markets out of the war panic of 1914, lends peculiar interest to the present agricultural outlook. But the harvest prospects as indicated by last week's Government crop report are in other respects even more important than the similar turn of events in those earlier years.

There can be no doubt that an extremely critical condition had arisen in regard to the food supply of our European allies. With their own grain production heavily curtailed, either by loss of territory to the enemy or by drain of agricultural labor to the war, and with Russia's crops first cut off by blockade and then reduced to insignificance by the lapse of the whole industrial situation into anarchy, Western Europe found itself bare of food reserves and reduced to absolute reliance on overseas producing states. But the depredations on Allied shipping facilities made it impossible to spare enough vessels to bring grain supplies over the long sea route from Australia and India; therefore it was the United States and Canada which had to bear practically all the burden. It was at precisely this moment that the wheat crop of America, in the two successive seasons of 1916 and 1917, ran disastrously short. Had that American shortage been repeated in 1918, it is difficult to say what the result would have been.

The Government's monthly crop estimate of June shows what has actually happened. Beginning under unfavorable auspices, as a result of an autumn drought, the winter wheat crop's condition changed decidedly for the better, first because of the heavy snowfall of the late winter months and then because of extremely favorable growing weather. Usually the tentative estimates of a winter wheat crop's indicated yield, put forth in December, are heavily reduced at the end of winter. On this occasion they were largely increased, until the Government's June report foreshadowed a yield 169,000,000 bushels larger than last year's winter wheat crop, and the third largest in the country's history.

Meantime, the exceptionally favorable weather conditions which had produced so unexpected results with the early crop were equally prevalent where the spring-sown wheat

was beginning to grow. As to that crop, there had been much divergence of opinion, both regarding acreage planted and regarding the average condition. The Department's first report on spring wheat was given out last week. It was very remarkable. Instead of the disappointing acreage which had been feared, even in the grain trade, the area planted to spring wheat was shown to have increased 3,450,000 acres over that of 1917, or fully 18 per cent. Even the acreage harvested in the great crop of 1915 fell short of this year's planting by more than three million acres. On this unprecedentedly large area, the average condition of the crop in June was within a small fraction of the high-est condition reached in twenty years.

The indicated yield as foreshadowed by the Government is not only 61,000,000 bushels greater than the last crop's June indication, but has only once been exceeded in the actual harvest out-turn. The Washington forecast of 931,000,000 bushels for the entire wheat crop would run forty million bushels beyond any other yield except the "billion-bushel harvest" of 1915. No doubt, the realizing of the predicted yield will be dependent on the character of this summer's weather in the spring wheat country. A turn for the worse in growing conditions would reduce the indicated yield; but, on the other hand, it is equally possible that continuance of the present ideal conditions may (as was the case in 1915) raise the estimate to the thousand-million-bushel figure. The winter wheat crop is practically "made," and spring wheat has begun growth under favorable auspices.

What, then, in tangible reality, would such a harvest mean to the general situation? Taken along with the recent great curtailment in home consumption of wheat, it would probably leave for export and reserves a greater supply than in any previous grain year of our history. It would make possible the shipment from our Atlantic ports of three or four times as much wheat as we have sent out during the past twelve months. If this were done, we should hear no more of food shortage among our allies, always supposing ship facilities to carry the grain to Europe. A harvest of such magnitude in 1917 would have found the ocean transportation service virtually unable to handle it. This crop will come to harvest just when our output of new merchant ships is reaching the goal set by the Government and the shipyards.

ALEXANDER D. NOYES

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Published Saturdays. Owned by THE NATION PRESS, INC.,
OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President.
EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher, Secy. and Treas.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second-class mail matter.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR
HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, MANAGING EDITOR
R. B. McCLEAN, BUSINESS MANAGER
WILLIAM G. PRESTON, ADVERTISING MANAGER
ROBERT R. CLELAND, CIRCULATION MANAGER

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, \$4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, \$5.00.
Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street.
P. O. Box 794, New York.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent St., S. W. WASHINGTON OFFICE:
Home Life Building; CHICAGO OFFICE: People's Gas Building.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

- Flickinger, R. C. *The Greek Theatre and Its Drama*. University of Chicago Press. \$3 net.
Kallen, H. M. *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy Restored*. Moffat, Yard. \$1.25 net.
Withington, R. *English Pageantry*. Harvard University Press. \$3.50.

FICTION

- Chekhov, A. *The Wife and Other Stories*. *The Witch and Other Stories*. Translated by Constance Garnett. Macmillan. \$1.50 each.
McKishnie, A. P. *Willow, the Wisp*. Houghton Mifflin. \$1.35 net.
Smith, A. D. H. *The Audacious Adventures of Miles McConaughy*. Doran. \$1.35 net.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

- Michaud, R. R. W. *Emerson—Autobiographie d'après son "Journal Intime," Tome II, 1841-1876*. Traduction, Introduction, et Notes. Librairie Armand Colin.
Radziwill, C. *Rasputin and the Russian Revolution*. Lane. \$3 net.
Sack, A. J. *The Birth of the Russian Democracy*. New York: Russian Information Bureau.

TRAVEL AND DESCRIPTION

- De Booy, T., and Faris, J. T. *The Virgin Islands*. Lippincott. \$3 net.
Howe, S. E. *Real Russians*. Lippincott. \$2 net.

SOCIAL SCIENCE

- Adams, H. C. *American Railway Accounting*. Holt. \$3 net.
Jackson, H. E. *A Community Centre*. Macmillan. \$1.
Phillips, U. B. *American Negro Slavery*. Appleton. \$3 net.
Report of the Prison Inquiry Commission, New Jersey, Volumes I and II. Trenton, N. J.
The Jewish Communal Register of New York City, 1917-18. New York: Kehillah.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

- Doyle, A. C. *The New Revelation*. Doran. \$1 net.
Horne, H. H. *Jesus—Our Standard*. Abingdon Press. \$1.25 net.
Knox, R. A. *A Spiritual Æneid*. Longmans, Green. \$2.50 net.
Moulton, R. G. *The Bible at a Single View*. Macmillan. \$1.
Spaulding, E. G. *The New Rationalism*. Holt. \$3.50 net.
Speer, R. E. *The Christian Man, the Church, and the War*. Macmillan. 60 cents.

EDUCATION

- Grimshaw, R. *Lessons in Personal Efficiency*. Macmillan. \$1.50.
Peabody, F. G. *Education for Life. The Story of Hampton Institute*. Doubleday, Page. \$2.50 net.
Rosenthal, D. C., and Chankin, V. *Grammaire de Conversation et de Lecture*. Holt.

THE WAR

- Brown, C. *Germany as It is To-day*. Doran. \$1.35 net.
Dugmore, A. R. *When the Somme Ran Red*. Doran. \$1.75 net.
Duhamel, G. *The New Book of Martyrs*. Translated by Florence Simmonds. Doran. \$1.35 net.
Grant, R. S. O. S. *Stand To!* Appleton. \$1.50 net.
Hutton, J. E. *Welfare and Housing*. Longmans, Green. \$1.50 net.
Mahoney, H. C. *Interned in Germany*. McBride. \$2 net.
Manion, R. J. *A Surgeon in Arms*. Appleton. \$1.50 net.
Taylor, A. E. *War Bread*. Macmillan. 60 cents.
Tricoche, G. N. *Our Army in a Nutshell*. New York: Harvey Publishing Co. 60 cents.
Wells, H. G. *In the Fourth Year*. Macmillan. \$1.25.
Weyl, W. E. *The End of the War*. Macmillan. \$2.

MISCELLANEOUS

- St. John, L. *Practical Bait Casting*. Macmillan. \$1.